

# **EXHIBIT 3**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS - WESTERN DIVISION

=====

IN THE MATTER OF:	.	Case #12-19882-hjb
	.	
NEW ENGLAND COMPOUNDING	.	
PHARMACY, INC.,	.	Springfield, Massachusetts
	.	July 24, 2013
Debtor.	.	1:04 p.m.

=====

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING ON:  
(#166) AMENDED APPLICATION OF CHAPTER 11  
TRUSTEE TO EMPLOY AND RETAIN HARRIS BEACH PLLC AS SPECIAL  
COUNSEL;  
(#167) MOTION OF CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING  
HIM TO BE REPRESENTED BY SPECIAL LOCAL COUNSEL IN THE ORDINARY  
COURSE OF BUSINESS;  
(#263) MOTION OF CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE FOR AN ORDER  
(I) ESTABLISHING BAR DATES FOR FILING PROOFS OF CLAIM;  
(II) APPROVING CERTAIN ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS  
AND PROCEDURES FOR PERSONAL INJURY TORT AND WRONGFUL-DEATH  
CLAIMS; (III) APPROVING THE FORM AND MANNER OF NOTICE; AND FOR  
ADDITIONAL RELATED RELIEF;  
(#326) MOTION OF BERTRAM WALKER BRYANT, JR. AND THE CREDITORS'  
COMMITTEE FOR A DECLARATION OF DEBTOR INSOLVENCY

BEFORE THE HONORABLE HENRY J. BOROFF

APPEARANCES:

<u>For the Chapter 11</u>	JEFFREY D. STERNKLAR, ESQ.
<u>Trustee, Paul D. Moore:</u>	DUANE MORRIS, LLP
	100 High Street
	24th Floor
	Boston, MA 02110

<u>For the United States</u>	PAULA R.C. BACHTELL, ESQ.
<u>Trustee:</u>	OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE
	5 Post Office Square
	Suite 1000
	Boston, MA 02109

<u>For the</u>	WILLIAM R. BALDIGA, ESQ.
<u>Official Committee of</u>	BROWN RUDNICK LLP
<u>Unsecured Creditors:</u>	One Financial Center
	Boston, MA 02111

APPEARANCES (cont'd.):

For Barry and  
Lisa Cadden:

HAROLD B. MURPHY, ESQ.  
MURPHY & KING  
One Beacon Street  
21st Floor  
Boston, MA 02108

For Bertram Walker  
Bryant, Jr.:

MICHAEL D. GALLIGAN, ESQ.  
LAW OFFICES OF GALLIGAN & NEWMAN  
309 West Main Street  
McMinnville, TN 37110

For Individual  
Defendants in  
the MDL Action:

WILLIAM J. DAILEY, JUNIOR, ESQ.  
SLOANE AND WALSH, LLP  
Three Center Plaza  
Boston, MA 02108

For the Plaintiffs'  
Steering Committee:

THOMAS M. SOBOL, ESQ.  
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
55 Cambridge Parkway  
Suite 301  
Cambridge, MA 02142

For Insight Health  
Corp.:

RONALD E. MEISLER, ESQ.  
(TELEPHONICALLY)  
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM  
LLP & AFFILIATES  
155 N. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606

For the Steering  
Committee:

MARC E. LIPTON, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)  
LIPTON LAW  
18930 W. 10 Mile Road  
Southfield, MI 48075

For Inspira Health  
Network, Inc. and  
Inspira Medical  
Centers, Inc.:

STEPHEN A. GROSSMAN, ESQ.  
(TELEPHONICALLY)  
MONTGOMERY McCRACKEN WALKER & RHOADS  
LLP  
457 Haddonfield Road  
Suite 600  
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002

JOSEPH O'NEIL, JR., ESQ.  
(TELEPHONICALLY)  
MONTGOMERY McCRACKEN WALKER & RHOADS  
LLP  
123 South Broad Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19109

APPEARANCES (cont'd.):

For PMIC:

RICHARD E. MIKELS, ESQ.  
(TELEPHONICALLY)  
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND  
POPEO PC  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111

For Chattanooga  
Neurosurgical Group:

CHRIS J. TARDIO, ESQ.  
(TELEPHONICALLY)  
GIDEON, COOPER & ESSARY, PLC  
315 Deaderick Street  
Suite 1100  
Nashville, TN 37238

For Dr. O'Connell's  
Pain Care Center:

WILLIAM E. CHRISTIE, ESQ.  
(TELEPHONICALLY)  
SHAHEEN & GORDON, P.A.  
107 Storrs Street  
Concord, NH 03302

For Erlanger Health  
System, Inc.:

CARA E. WEINER, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)  
SPEARS, MOORE, REBMAN & WILLIAMS,  
P.C.  
801 Broad Street  
Sixth Floor  
Chattanooga, TN 37401

Electronic Sound Recording Operator: Laura L. Chambers

Proceedings Recorded by Electronic Sound Recording  
Transcript Produced by Certified Transcription Service  
ESCRIBERS, LLC  
700 West 192nd Street Suite 607, New York, NY 10040  
1-973-406 2250; operations@escribers.net

## I N D E X

RULING:	PAGE	LINE
Motion of Bertram Walker Bryant, Jr., and the creditors' committee for a declaration of debtor insolvency, granted.	23	17
Motion of Chapter 11 trustee for an order authorizing him to be represented by special local counsel in the ordinary course of business, granted.	26	20
Application of Chapter 11 trustee to employ and retain Harris Beach PLLC as special counsel, approved.	39	18
Harris Beach is to file quarterly disclosures of time in the case, but disclosure is to be sent only to the United States Trustee, the Chapter 11 trustee, counsel to the Chapter 11 trustee, counsel to the unsecured creditors' committee, and counsel to the plaintiffs' steering committee, absent further court order.	39	19
The Court will not rule on the reasonableness of the Harris Beach fees, absent a request for that ruling from either the insurer or from Harris Beach.	39	25
Notice should be sent to those people who received products that the CDC said were contaminated.	106	16
Notice intermediaries should be the entities who administered the contaminated product.	107	7
The notice should not identify any particular third party targets.	108	3
Noticing agent must be appointed through the bankruptcy court.	109	7
Notice intermediaries who administered contaminated lots identified by the CDC are to supply the names, addresses, last four digits of the Social Security number, what was administered and when, to the Chapter 11 Trustee on or before August 16.	111	3
Notice to be published ten days after the bar date order, and then twenty days before the expiration of the order, in newspapers that were listed in the trustee's amended supplemental bar-date motion.	111	12
By August 22, counsel for Chapter 11 Trustee, PSC and the creditors' committee are to create a joint list of who should receive notice.	112	3

RULING (cont'd.):

	PAGE	LINE
By end of week, Chapter 11 Trustee to submit proposed revised notice requesting that intermediaries turn over lists to the Chapter 11 Trustee and counsel for the PSC, in confidence by August 16.	112	12
Modifications to the notice will be discussed on August 22 at 10 a.m.	112	16
Revised form of notice due by August 16.	116	12
Order as to docket #263 is an interim order.	119	11

1 (At 1:04 p.m.)

2 THE CLERK: All rise.

3 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

4 Sorry for the technical delays.

5 THE CLERK: Case number 12-19882, New England  
6 Compounding Pharmacy, Inc.; a hearing on the amended  
7 application of the Chapter 11 trustee to employ and retain  
8 Harris Beach PLLC, as special counsel; a hearing on the motion  
9 of the Chapter 11 trustee for an order authorizing him to be  
10 represented by special local counsel in the ordinary course of  
11 business; a hearing on the motion of the Chapter 11 trustee  
12 for an order establishing bar dates for filing proofs of  
13 claim, approving certain additional documentation requirements  
14 and procedures for personal-injury tort and wrongful-death  
15 claims, and approving the form and manner of notice, and for  
16 additional relief; as well as a motion of Bertram Walker  
17 Bryan, Jr. and the creditors' committee, for a declaration of  
18 debtor insolvency.

19 Beginning with Ms. Bachtell on my right, could I ask  
20 counsel present in the courtroom in Springfield, please  
21 identify themselves as well as who they represent.

22 MS. BACHTELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Paula  
23 Bachtell for the U.S. Trustee.

24 MR. STERNKLAR: Good afternoon. Jeffrey Sternklar  
25 from Duane Morris, representing Paul Moore, the Chapter 11

1 trustee.

2 MR. BALDIGA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. William  
3 Baldiga, Brown Rudnick, for the official committee of  
4 unsecured creditors.

5 MR. GALLIGAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mike  
6 Galligan from Tennessee, representing Walter Bryant, Jr., as  
7 well as a number of other creditors.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor,  
10 first, I want to thank you for your accommodations to us over  
11 the past few weeks, with scheduling. We've had to move these  
12 hearings around and we're not unmindful of the burden that  
13 imposes on the Court, and we thank you for your patience with  
14 that.

15 Second, there are essentially three matters on for  
16 hearing today: There's the trustee's motion to establish a  
17 bar date; there are two professional-retention motions that  
18 are somewhat related; and there is a motion by the creditors'  
19 committee and Mr. Galligan's client, for a declaration of  
20 insolvency. Notwithstanding the flurry of papers and the  
21 widespread participation, I believe we've made significant  
22 process in resolving many of the issues that will arise with  
23 respect to all three motions. Unfortunately, I can't tell you  
24 we've resolved all issues. It will be my hope that I can  
25 outline what the remaining issues are, and they can be



1 disposed of in some orderly fashion.

2 With Your Honor's indulgence, I believe Mr. Galligan  
3 has a plane he needs to catch, so, with your indulgence, we  
4 would take the insolvency motion first.

5 THE COURT: Sure.

6 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: For the benefit of those on the  
8 telephone, I'm afraid we'll have to keep reintroducing who we  
9 are as speaker.

10 MR. BALDIGA: Absolutely, Your Honor. And this is  
11 William Baldiga, Brown Rudnick, counsel for the official  
12 committee of unsecured creditors.

13 And, Your Honor, we're here on the motion, as  
14 announced, with respect to the finding that this debtor is  
15 insolvent; hearkens back to, for some of us, pre-Code days,  
16 perhaps when those things were -- the last time any of us had  
17 seen those. And perhaps the Tennessee statute also goes back  
18 to the days before the Code, in the 1970s, because it seems to  
19 be a legacy type of thing that I've never seen before and I'm  
20 sure for the Court is somewhat novel as well.

21 Mr. Galligan and I, Your Honor, think that the  
22 better way to present this to the Court is first for me to  
23 introduce you to Mr. Galligan, who does represent Mr. Bryant,  
24 and he could explain a little bit about the background of the  
25 Tennessee statute. We have resolved the trustee's objection,

1 but I would like to speak to the other remaining objections,  
2 and hopefully this will be something that the Court can  
3 understand where we come from. Thank you.

4 THE COURT: Thank you.

5 MR. BALDIGA: And, Your Honor, I'm not even sure  
6 whether we have filed a motion for the pro hac admission of  
7 Mr. Galligan.

8 MR. GALLIGAN: I sent it to --

9 MR. BALDIGA: Then I think we have. I'm sorry.

10 THE COURT: All right. Okay.

11 MR. BALDIGA: If not, we will check the docket and  
12 certainly do that this week.

13 THE COURT: Let's move on.

14 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you.

15 MR. GALLIGAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. As I  
16 said earlier --

17 THE COURT: Again --

18 MR. GALLIGAN: -- I'm Mike Galligan --

19 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Yes. Go ahead.

20 MR. GALLIGAN: -- from Tennessee. I represent  
21 Walker Bryant, Jr., who's the husband of Margaret Bryant, who  
22 died on September the 18th, 2012; she died as the result of a  
23 shot of MPA that was manufactured by NECC. Additionally, I'm  
24 a member of the OCC; would like to say that I've been a -- and  
25 assure the Court that I've been a strong supporter of the

1 bankruptcy resolution of this matter, since the inception. We  
2 filed our first lawsuit against NECC only. We now are looking  
3 to file against other affiliates, other pain -- the pain  
4 clinic, et cetera. I have other clients, but this is the one  
5 I'm here on today.

6 I'm asking for a declaration of insolvency; that's  
7 because of a Tennessee statute that I will go into in just a  
8 few moments. I don't think it's contested that NECC's  
9 insolvent. None of the pleadings that have responded to our  
10 motion have mentioned it at all. I think it is -- I had an  
11 old judge tell me one time -- and I'm not suggesting you're an  
12 old judge by any means -- I had --

13 THE COURT: I was married --

14 MR. GALLIGAN: -- but when I was a young lawyer,  
15 that nothing is obvious in the law. But there's not much more  
16 obvious than we're asking the Court to make a declaration of  
17 something that is pretty obvious to everybody: that NECC is  
18 insolvent. There've been over -- last time I checked, over  
19 741 injuries, 61 deaths, of which my client's wife was one of  
20 them. The -- so I don't think that's contested.

21 So we're just asking the Court to do really what's  
22 obvious. Now, why are we asking that? 29-28-106 -- and let  
23 me go over it, if I could, that statute, with you -- in  
24 Tennessee it says, and this is on the cause of action of  
25 strict liability that we would like to bring against the St.

1 Thomas Neurological Outpatient clinic, and we have -- I don't  
2 know that the Court wants to hear all the grounds about it or  
3 that this is the place and time, but this statute says, "No  
4 product-liability action, as defined in 29-280-102", which is  
5 the statute defining products-liability actions, "shall be  
6 commenced or maintained against any seller other than the  
7 manufacturer unless" -- the first three are totally irrelevant  
8 to our issues today; 4 and 5 may be discussed. 5 is the one  
9 that we're here about; it says, "unless [the] manufacturer has  
10 been judicially declared insolvent". So it isn't just a case,  
11 according to the statute here, that they are insolvent, but  
12 must be judicially declared insolvent. We came to this Court  
13 on this issue because this Court is certainly more, and is  
14 eminently, involved in this. And NECC, to bring it in any  
15 other court, would have to be made a party, we believe, and  
16 there's a stay concerning that.

17 So this is, it seems to me, the most efficient court  
18 for everyone, all of the plaintiffs, in Tennessee. And all  
19 the plaintiffs' lawyers -- just about all have contacted me  
20 about it -- are interested in this. And this would stave off  
21 multiple filings, lots of expense, just for this Court to  
22 declare what is most obvious, really.

23 Now, I have read, and I'm sure the Court has read,  
24 some of the briefs that came in against it, and some will  
25 mention other things, such as, could we not do it under number

1 4 above, on that, without the necessity of this. But one  
2 thing Plaintiffs' lawyers, as this Court I'm sure is aware,  
3 want to do is avoid issues that can later lead to reversal,  
4 later lead to problems down the road. This is simple, it's  
5 nice, and it does it, but however, under number 4, the  
6 manufacturer, distributor of the product or part in question  
7 is not subject to service of process in this state. If it  
8 ended there, we would be fine, because NECC's not subject to  
9 process -- service of process in Tennessee. But it says "and"  
10 the long-arm statutes of Tennessee do not serve as the basis  
11 for obtaining service of process.

12 Now, there have been a couple cases cited that  
13 state, well, maybe they could, but that's under another  
14 statute, and that was an older statute, 29-28-106(b), in which  
15 it said -- instead of "and", it was "or". So those cases are  
16 totally inapplicable to the argument today.

17 So, without delaying the issue, we want to get  
18 around the substantive pre-filing requirement; and to do that,  
19 it would help us, and I think it would save a lot of expense,  
20 if we could have an order declaring NECC insolvent as of the  
21 day of their filing and subsequently. Thank you, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 Mr. Baldiga?

24 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you, Your Honor. William  
25 Baldiga again, for the committee.

1           The committee takes seriously its obligations here,  
2   Your Honor, to represent the creditor body generally. We do  
3   not represent any particular victim, even victims who happen  
4   to be members of our committee. We do not represent any of  
5   the clinics in their own capacity, even if they have an  
6   indemnity claim. But we are here, and we joined this motion,  
7   for important reasons that are benefits to the estate, and  
8   that's the stress I want to make.

9           In Tennessee alone, Your Honor, there have been 153  
10   reported meningitis cases and at least 15 deaths. Tennessee  
11   is a particular area that has been devastated by the tainted  
12   MPA. And as Mr. Galligan said, at the present time, only a  
13   small fraction of those suits have been filed, but we do have  
14   a one-year statute of limitations that arises as early as  
15   September; so we are nearly weeks away from that statute of  
16   limitations.

17           If this motion were allowed, this does not create  
18   any liability; it's solely to minimize the expense and to  
19   increase the efficiency as to the assertion -- ability to  
20   assert liability, subject to whatever defenses may lie. So,  
21   allowance of this motion does not create liability in the  
22   least and is not a determination by this Court or a view by  
23   the committee or by the trustee or anyone else that liability  
24   should apply or that the statute has validity on its merits,  
25   these claims come under the statute, or anything else in that

1 regard.

2 If the motion is denied, these plaintiffs, as well  
3 as whatever injuries may lie in Tennessee, will each be faced  
4 with a quandary of complying with the statute of limitations.  
5 I can understand why they may want to at least assert the  
6 statutory liability. Whether or not down the road there's  
7 ever a trial on any of those cases or a motion to dismiss,  
8 that day will perhaps come. But each of them will then need  
9 to seek relief somewhere in state court, other federal courts,  
10 this court, maybe a hodgepodge of courts, as to that  
11 declaration. That almost certainly implicates this estate in  
12 each of those. There could be inconsistent rulings; there  
13 could be ancillary relief that is joined. And it would seem  
14 to be a mess, and mess equals expense, and it's expense to  
15 this estate in two respects: one, it requires the trustee and  
16 the committee to understand what's going on in what may be a  
17 couple of hundred or more requests; second, the request is  
18 likely to be made in the context of litigation against  
19 parties, such as clinics, that have indemnity claims against  
20 this estate, for evaluating and responding to those requests.  
21 And there would be a multiplicity by 100 or 200 factor as to  
22 the expense that we've already incurred here. And there's no  
23 benefit to this estate to having that tremendous expense, even  
24 if a lot of them consist of motions for relief to this Court.

25 We have also, Your Honor, worked with the trustee

1 carefully. The trustee did file an objection, and one or the  
2 other objections was focused on an important purpose of  
3 whatever relief here should be to maximize the incentive on  
4 the many Tennessee personal-injury and victim death cases, to  
5 be centralized in the MDL.

6 As Your Honor knows, it is the stated goal of the  
7 trustee and of the committee, from the outset of this case, to  
8 centralize as many cases in the MDL as possible. And this  
9 motion, with a revision especially to the order, after much  
10 discussion with the trustee, will do that. And, Your Honor,  
11 I'd like to hand up -- and I have copies for others, I think,  
12 as many as others want to see that. But I certainly will read  
13 it clearly over the phone for everyone, because I think at  
14 least one of the objecting parties is present by telephone.  
15 May I approach, Your Honor?

16 THE COURT: Yes, please.

17 MR. BALDIGA: I refer to decretal paragraph 4.  
18 There are two changes, Your Honor; one change, which is not  
19 delineated in pencil here, is to eliminate what was romanette  
20 iii, and that's eliminated altogether. Romanette iii  
21 provided -- well, let me just start at the -- romanette i --  
22 this is the application of this -- is that this order would  
23 apply to actions that have been filed or will be filed  
24 directly in the MDL proceeding. There is a question that has  
25 been raised by some parties as to whether there is related-to



1 jurisdiction as to cases that do not name NECC or an affiliate  
2 of NECC; so ii are -- is that this would apply to cases that  
3 have been or will be removed or transferred to the MDL  
4 proceeding. And my penciled-in comment -- so -- and I'll read  
5 it, then, in full, by agreement with the trustee, so that ii  
6 is complete -- romanette ii would be, "subject to removal or  
7 transfer to the MDL proceeding, that have been or will be  
8 removed or transferred to the MDL proceeding".

9 And then romanette iii is eliminated altogether.  
10 Romanette iii previously referred to actions filed in some  
11 other court, for which there was a consent to remove or  
12 transfer. Frankly, Mr. Galligan's client would have very much  
13 preferred that but, in the spirit of compromise and, again,  
14 working hand in hand with the trustee to maximize the  
15 incentive for all to have these claims administered in the MDL  
16 proceeding, we've agreed on this language.

17 THE COURT: After the clause "subject to removal or  
18 transfer to the MDL proceeding", instead of the comma,  
19 wouldn't it be clearer if it said "and"?

20 MR. BALDIGA: I'm happy to do that.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. STERNKLAR: That's fine, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: All right.

24 MR. BALDIGA: And let me ask -- I have three or four  
25 other copies.

1           Are there others in the courtroom that want a copy  
2 of this?

3           Doesn't seem to be the most popular matter in the  
4 court today.

5           Your Honor, I would then turn -- because one of  
6 those directly relates this language to the two objections  
7 that have been filed, and I believe that at least one of the  
8 objectors is -- and perhaps both -- on the telephone; I  
9 believe that neither is in the court. St. Thomas Outpatient  
10 Center, docket number 373, filed an objection with two  
11 grounds: one is that the motion is moot because these product  
12 liability claims will at some point fail on the merits, and so  
13 I think it's a futility type of objection. I stress, and I  
14 stress again, this is not a position by the trustee, by the  
15 committee or anyone else, including by Mr. Galligan's client,  
16 for this Court to make any finding whatsoever. There's been  
17 no effort as to the merits of this; it is solely a procedural  
18 pre-filing requirement to facilitate and minimize the cost to  
19 the estate, of claims being asserted.

20           And I -- so I want to clarify on the record; I  
21 thought the motion was clear in that regard but, certainly,  
22 St. Thomas and every other party here deserves to have it be  
23 without doubt whatsoever that there's nothing here that were  
24 to pre-judge the merits of anything.

25           Second, a -- second objection by St. Thomas is that

1 the committee here has a duty to Tennessee healthcare  
2 providers, on account of implicitly that they have the same  
3 type of indemnity contribution claims that I mentioned  
4 earlier. These -- and you'll hear later in the bar-date  
5 motion, these indemnity claims, or potential indemnity claims,  
6 that are now being incurred, are a primary driver of  
7 everything that the trustee and the committee talk about. And  
8 while we respect very much that St. Thomas and others have  
9 these indemnity claims, and we're trying to minimize those, we  
10 do not owe a fiduciary or other duty to any creditor. We owe  
11 a fiduciary duty to the creditor body consisting of all  
12 general unsecured claims more generally. And while we may  
13 side on this or other issues in a way that favor or disfavor  
14 certain groups of creditors, we do so only because we believe  
15 that it's best for the creditor body generally.

16 So we do owe a duty to St. Thomas and to  
17 Mr. Galligan's client and to every other general unsecured  
18 claim but not one that precludes us from taking positions on  
19 this or any other motion in the case, if we think it benefits  
20 creditors generally. And we are, after a great deal of  
21 discussions -- this -- the filing of this motion followed  
22 eight weeks of discussion with the trustee. So we take that  
23 duty seriously.

24 The second objection, Your Honor, is the Inspira  
25 Health Network, docket 391, and two objections are noted: the

1 same duty of loyalty that I mentioned -- I obviously won't  
2 repeat that again -- and secondly, at paragraph 11, asks that  
3 the relief entered by this Court is -- would be limited to  
4 cases filed in or going to the MDL. And it so happens that  
5 the resolution of the trustee's objection does exactly that.  
6 So we've satisfied the second objection, I believe.  
7 Obviously, Inspira can speak for itself but, as to that  
8 objection, I think we are -- we've done exactly what they  
9 asked.

10 So, Your Honor, it's an odd motion, one that I would  
11 not have anticipated, even in a case that has quite a few  
12 twists and turns already, but one that, again, the benefit to  
13 the estate is very real. And, happy to answer any questions  
14 the Court may have, but believe it's something that is very  
15 important to get done, and get done today, so that the 160,  
16 170-odd claimants who we've been telling 'Hold off. Don't  
17 incur expense. Don't make the estate incur expense' can get  
18 done what they need to do without putting the estate through  
19 that ringer.

20 THE COURT: Thank you.

21 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Is counsel for St. Thomas on the phone?

23 MR. TARIO: Yes, sir. This is Chris Tario from  
24 Nashville.

25 THE COURT: All right, sir, do you want to speak to

1 your objection, if you still have one?

2 MR. TARIO: Yes, sir, and I appreciate the Court's  
3 indulgence, especially by phone. First and foremost, I think  
4 that I do take exception, respectfully, to the representation  
5 by Mr. Galligan that the objection did not object to the  
6 notion that NECC is insolvent. On page 1 of our response,  
7 footnote 2, we do object to the finding that NECC is  
8 insolvent. And frankly, based on what is in front of the  
9 Court, respectfully, I don't believe that there's sufficient  
10 proof that, at this point at least, based on the record that  
11 the Court's deciding upon, NECC is insolvent under the test  
12 set out in the motions.

13 So, first and foremost, I guess I take exception  
14 with Mr. Galligan's first comment that he started off with.  
15 The remainder of our objections to the substance of the motion  
16 were characterized accurately by counsel who spoke before me.  
17 The relief that the creditors' committee seeks is -- they're  
18 seeking a remedy -- a nonmeaningful remedy and that if the  
19 Court were to grant this motion and these cases were filed  
20 under this theory of liability, it's not going to -- it's not  
21 tenable as a matter of law in Tennessee to maintain products  
22 liability actions against healthcare providers.

23 So it is a utility argument, and I would  
24 respectfully submit that granting the motion allowing suits to  
25 be filed under this theory, and then having to rule on motions

1 to dismiss, adds expense to the case when in the first place  
2 the claim is not tenable as a matter of law. So that is the  
3 first grounds for our objection.

4 Related, we -- as we put in our papers, the  
5 exclusive remedy under the -- under Tennessee law, for any  
6 claim against a healthcare provider, related to the provision  
7 of health care, is pursuant to the Health Care Liability Act.  
8 So even if the Court grants this motion, Tennessee claimants  
9 cannot -- contrary to I think what was suggested in the  
10 motion, cannot walk out tomorrow and file products liability  
11 claims; pre-suit notice still has to be served on healthcare  
12 defendants, under our Title 29, Chapter 26. So that in -- if  
13 the motive or the grounds for the motion is that the claims  
14 will be filed immediately and need to be filed immediately,  
15 they can't; the plaintiffs still have to comply with the  
16 pre-suit notice period requirements.

17 And lastly, Your Honor, the creditors' committee --  
18 and I understand the position taken by the creditors'  
19 committee as articulated a moment ago but, even if you  
20 characterize the duty of the creditors' committee to all  
21 creditors generally to exercise that duty to the body  
22 generally, I believe, respectfully, the case law requires that  
23 the committee not favor certain classes of creditors over  
24 other classes of creditors. We are -- us in Tennessee and  
25 other clinics and hospitals are creditors. We not only have

1 an indemnity claim against NECC; we also have breach-of-  
2 warranty claims against NECC for providing us these unfit  
3 products. So we do have claims against NECC, we do fit within  
4 the class of creditors, and we are owed a duty as part of the  
5 body. So we would respectfully submit that that is grounds  
6 for denial of the motion that the creditors' committee, in  
7 bringing the motion as a joining movant, is breaching that  
8 duty.

9 So we would respectfully submit, for all those  
10 reasons and the reasons we set out in our response, that the  
11 motion be denied.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 And Inspira, does it have counsel on the phone?

14 MR. O'NEIL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Joseph  
15 O'Neil for Inspira.

16 Your Honor, with respect to the changes to the  
17 proposed order, that was our main concern, that the claims  
18 here would be limited to the MDL proceeding. We discussed  
19 this yesterday with the trustee and we appreciate his efforts  
20 in coordinating with the committee counsel in order to revise  
21 the order to reflect that. Given those changes, I believe  
22 that we are okay with respect to the order, and we would agree  
23 that, as long as it's limited to the MDL, we're okay with it  
24 going forward.

25 THE COURT: Does anyone else on the telephone wish

1 to be heard with respect to this motion?

2 All right, hearing nothing, the Chapter 11 trustee?

3 MR. STERNKLAR: Your Honor, just briefly. The  
4 change in the order resolves our objection; it squarely places  
5 the risk on the plaintiffs that they will be unable to get the  
6 case transferred or removed or asserted in the MDL; that's a  
7 risk they should bear, not the trustee. It's important to the  
8 trustee's overall goals here that case -- as many cases as  
9 possible get consolidated into the MDL. So we read the order  
10 now as providing that only those cases heard and determined in  
11 the MDL, or at least transferred to the MDL, will have the  
12 benefit of this finding. And with that, we no longer object.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Does the United States Trustee  
14 have a view?

15 MS. BACHTELL: U.S. Trustee has no opposition, Your  
16 Honor.

17 THE COURT: I'll enter the order. I think it makes  
18 sense from the perspective of judicial economy, for the  
19 reasons mentioned by counsel for the creditors' committee, and  
20 it also promotes economy for the affected creditors. I see no  
21 prejudice for the estate. The insolvency of this debtor is  
22 apparent; it has been so from the outset. And in fact, at the  
23 very first hearing in this case, counsel for the debtor  
24 reported that, in his view, in the debtor's view, the  
25 insurance proceeds would be very much insufficient to meet the



1 debtor's claims.

2           With respect to the issue raised by St. Thomas  
3 Outpatient Neurological Center and others who joined in that  
4 motion, with respect to whether or not these claims, if I  
5 granted the motion, would then be ripe for filing in their  
6 home court, claims in the bankruptcy case may be contingent,  
7 they may be unliquidated, but they are still claims. And it  
8 is irrelevant that there may in fact be additional hoops which  
9 those creditors would have to overcome in order to file civil  
10 actions. All that is important is that they are, or may be,  
11 owed monies under the definition of claims in the Bankruptcy  
12 Code.

13           And then finally, with respect to the concern raised  
14 about the duty of the creditors' committee, I have to agree  
15 with the committee that its fiduciary duty is only to general  
16 unsecured creditors as a body, not to any particular unsecured  
17 creditor or even any class of unsecured creditors. Now,  
18 indeed, on occasion, creditors' committees are granted the  
19 authority to seek preference recoveries against individual  
20 creditors who are members of their constituency, and that is  
21 not viewed as a conflict, because, in the end, the  
22 responsibility of the committee is to seek the highest  
23 possible dividend for general unsecured creditors as a whole.

24           Accordingly, I will enter this order. Is it your  
25 intention that I sign it with the language marked up, or would

1       you prefer to send something in?

2               MR. BALDIGA: Unless the Court has some preference;  
3 otherwise, we're fine with this as marked.

4               THE COURT: Okay. Hold on just a moment.

5               All right, one down.

6               MR. GALLIGAN: Your Honor, may I --

7               MR. BALDIGA: Your Honor, may Mr. Galligan have  
8 leave to go to the airport?

9               MR. GALLIGAN: I have --

10              THE COURT: Well, I will miss you, Mr. Galligan, but  
11 if you have to go --

12              MR. GALLIGAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

13              THE COURT: -- go on.

14              MR. GALLIGAN: I got to go down South where it's  
15 been cooler than it has been --

16              THE COURT: Yeah. Safe travel, sir.

17              MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor. With Your  
18 Honor's indulgence, I would propose we take up the bar-date  
19 motion next.

20              THE COURT: Okay. You think that's easier than the  
21 employment motions?

22              MR. STERNKLAR: I don't know that's easier or not,  
23 but it certainly --

24              THE COURT: Let's do the employment motions.

25              MR. STERNKLAR: Do the employment motion first?

1 THE COURT: Yes, yes.

2 MR. STERNKLAR: Okay. Your Honor, there are two  
3 employment motions on for hearing: There is the motion -- the  
4 trustee's motion to retain Harris Beach as special counsel,  
5 pursuant to 327(e), and the related motion to retain local  
6 counsel as ordinary-course professionals. The easier one  
7 perhaps is the local counsel; they aren't doing much right  
8 now; the cases are stayed as against the estate. But under  
9 local law, we need local counsel in those jurisdictions. And  
10 these are people identified by Mr. Fern at Harris Beach as  
11 being particularly capable in this area. We would ask Your  
12 Honor to allow that motion, as there's no objection to it  
13 pending. I don't know that there's anything remarkable or  
14 unusual in there, or certainly wasn't intended to be if there  
15 was.

16 THE COURT: Is there anyone who wishes to be heard  
17 with respect to that motion?

18 (No response)

19 THE COURT: All right, hearing nothing -- do you  
20 have an order for me to sign, or do you want me to simply  
21 endorse it as granted?

22 MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Which? Want me to endorse it as --

24 MR. STERNKLAR: Endorse it as granted --

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. STERNKLAR: -- is fine. Thank you, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Thank you.

3 MR. STERNKLAR: Next is the motion of trustee to  
4 retain Harris Beach. Harris Beach is a firm that was  
5 identified and retained by the debtor's insurer, Pharmacist  
6 Mutual Insurance Company to provide insurance defense coverage  
7 pre-petition to the insurers under the policy who were the  
8 debtor and certain individuals who are collectively referred  
9 to as insiders in our motion.

10 When this case was first filed, it became apparent  
11 or when the trustee was first appointed, it became apparent to  
12 the trustee that Mr. Fern possesses a unique combination of  
13 both expertise and credibility. He's a registered pharmacist,  
14 he has handled numerous complex mass tort cases on the defense  
15 side. He also is credible. He has the respect of, I think,  
16 not just the trustee, but of the plaintiffs' attorneys as well  
17 and he is for all the reasons we've articulated in the various  
18 papers we've filed, we believe, uniquely qualified to  
19 represent the trustee and be the point person.

20 Now, we heard Your Honor loud and clear multiple  
21 times before. We think we heard them; it is important to the  
22 trustee that he be able to retain Mr. Fern. So we propose  
23 changes to his retention. Originally we had proposed that the  
24 trustee would be jointly represented by Harris beach with the  
25 insiders. That's no longer proposed. Now what's proposed is

1 that Harris Beach will solely represent the trustee; solely  
2 with respect to the insurance defense matters, as outlined in  
3 the application. His sole duty of loyalty will be to the  
4 trustee. The insiders, as we call them, have retained  
5 separate counsel.

6 As Mr. Fern made clear in his declaration, all of  
7 the information he has about the underlying merits of this  
8 case are, in his view, not confidential. He obtained them  
9 from his own investigation review of the documents. We need  
10 just to clarify that, of course, it's not in the estate's  
11 interest that anyone be able to claim he's violating or  
12 breaching any privileges that may inure to the benefit of the  
13 insiders. That would open up a lot of things we don't want to  
14 open up.

15 But there's no information that he has that he can't  
16 share because he's obtained all the relevant information from  
17 his own investigation. So it's not as if there's anything  
18 about the merits of these defenses that he can't use, he can't  
19 share, he can't do with whatever he wants, notwithstanding his  
20 prior representation of these individuals. Well, of course,  
21 he won't disclose things, the contents of his communications  
22 with the insiders because those are privileged. The  
23 information that is the subject of those communications is  
24 information he has acquired from other sources and he can  
25 share with the trustee.

1           So we've been mindful of the concerns expressed with  
2       respect to other professionals that there be no dual  
3       loyalties. We've been mindful of the concerns expressed that  
4       there be no restrictions on the trustee's ability to share  
5       information -- for professionals' ability to share information  
6       with the trustee with respect to the matters on which they're  
7       employed. We've tried and we believe we've successfully  
8       resolved those problems with this proposed change to the  
9       employment arrangement. And we've provided a supplemental  
10      declaration for Mr. Fern. I think we'll add another  
11      supplemental declaration to clarify the point of the privilege  
12      because we didn't say that affirmatively in our declaration,  
13      but we would ask Your Honor to approve his retention on those  
14      revised terms.

15           I believe the last point is, Your Honor, if Your  
16      Honor wants him to file fee applications, he's perfectly  
17      prepared to do that, notwithstanding that he's being paid  
18      solely by the insurer and it's not what is colloquially  
19      referred to as a wasting policy. So payments for defense  
20      costs don't affect the limits -- the obligation or the amounts  
21      available for indemnity under the policy. But he's perfectly  
22      prepared to do that if Your Honor wants.

23           THE COURT: To what extent may Harris Beach's  
24      loyalties be distracted by the fact that he's being paid by  
25      the insurer?

1 MR. STERNKLAR: I don't think at all. This is not  
2 uncommon. If anything, he's an insurance defense counsel,  
3 he's not getting involved in insurance coverage issues. He's  
4 staying completely out of that. PMIC has retained Mr. Mikels  
5 and Mintz Levin to deal with coverage issues. Indeed, this is  
6 even more beneficial than the usual circumstance where defense  
7 counsel is paid by an insurer because in many of those cases,  
8 the policy wastes. In this case, it does not.

9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Does --

12 MR. STERNKLAR: May I have one moment, Your Honor?

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 (Pause)

15 MR. STERNKLAR: Your Honor, perhaps in an  
16 overabundance of caution, the counsel for the insiders has  
17 requested an opportunity to review the supplemental  
18 declaration I mentioned that Mr. Fern will file with respect  
19 to privilege to be sure it says what I've said it will say.  
20 We -- I don't have a problem; I fully anticipate it will say  
21 what I said it would say.

22 THE COURT: Well, I'll handle that at the end.

23 MR. STERNKLAR: Okay, thank you, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to be  
25 heard with respect to this motion?

1 Mr. Baldiga?

2 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you, Your Honor; William Baldiga  
3 for the Official Committee again.

4 Your Honor, we've talked through this extensively  
5 with the trustee. We think the accommodation that he has made  
6 in deference to the Court's comments and informal objections  
7 by various parties, the U.S. Trustee and others, does address  
8 those concerns in a very responsible way. Mr. Fern adds  
9 considerable value here, and we think that it helps to drive  
10 the case forward for this to be allowed. So we support this  
11 fully.

12 THE COURT: United States Trustee?

13 MS. BACHTELL: Thank you, Your Honor. Paula  
14 Bachtell for the U.S. Trustee.

15 Your Honor, initially, the U.S. Trustee was  
16 concerned about the retention. The UST's office has worked  
17 closely with the Chapter 11 trustee and there is an amended  
18 pleading before the Court. And now that the representation is  
19 limited and a fee app will be filed that will allow all of us  
20 to review it and to object with respect to any issues of  
21 unreasonableness, it's a close call, Your Honor. The UST is  
22 relying on the business judgment of the Chapter 11 trustee.  
23 We feel he's in the best position to make the decision, and in  
24 light of that, the UST has not filed an objection to this  
25 retention application as amended. Thank you.



1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2 Sir? If you'd identify yourself for the record and  
3 for those on the phone?

4 MR. DAILEY: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. My name is  
5 William Dailey, Bill Dailey. I'm a lawyer in Boston with  
6 Sloan and Walsh. We expect to be filing an appearance on  
7 behalf of the individual defendants in the MDL action.

8 I would make the observation that we inure to  
9 Pharmacist Mutual. We have had no relationship with them in  
10 the past. We've had very good conversations with them as we  
11 get ready to come in. But I think that Mr. Fern brings a  
12 unique perspective here. He is someone that they are very  
13 comfortable with.

14 THE COURT: You're speaking for or against the  
15 motion?

16 MR. DAILEY: I'm speaking for.

17 They are very comfortable with -- and I think that  
18 is important as I try to develop some background information.  
19 I asked about resolution and whether or not there was any  
20 discussion about resolution. I was told that I should go very  
21 slowly in that regard and that I should -- was not going to be  
22 provided with a lot of information. But nevertheless, I think  
23 Mr. Fern brings with him the ability to speak with Pharmacist  
24 Mutual which is a relatively small mutual company, but a good  
25 one, a solid one, in Iowa. And they will listen to him on

1 that subject. Hopefully, in time, my credibility will be  
2 developed with them, but I don't have it right now, and I  
3 think that he can help us along as we approach that very, very  
4 important question, and hopefully can assist greatly.

5 Secondly, as we try to get ramped up and represent  
6 the individual defendants, Mr. Fern has an awful lot of  
7 information that you get when you come into a case early.  
8 It's hard to come in eight or ten months after the matter  
9 has -- after the incident has occurred. I would urge that the  
10 Court consider keeping Mr. Fern in place representing NECC.

11 And thanks for the opportunity to speak.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 Does anyone on the telephone wish to be heard on  
14 this motion?

15 MR. MIKELS: Yes, Your Honor; Richard Mikels for  
16 Pharmacist Mutual.

17 THE COURT: Go ahead.

18 MR. MIKELS: First of all, if it becomes an issue  
19 that we're paying defense counsel, whether it's Mr. Fern or  
20 anybody else, then I will -- I haven't discussed this with my  
21 client but I think we can probably offer to be relieved of  
22 that obligation if it makes plaintiff more comfortable.

23 THE COURT: Thank you --

24 MR. MIKELS: However, assuming --

25 THE COURT: -- thank you for your input. Is there

1 something else?

2 MR. MIKELS: Yes, Your Honor.

3 We do support Mr. Fern and on the issue of the fee  
4 applications and whether they should be required, I don't  
5 think that is an issue in terms of whether he should be  
6 employed or not. But to the extent it becomes an issue, we'd  
7 like to be heard on it.

8 THE COURT: Well --

9 MR. MIKELS: So I just want to preserve my rights on  
10 that.

11 THE COURT: Mr. Sternklar, you phrased this somewhat  
12 in the alternative, and I don't recall whether the amended  
13 application takes a position. Does it take a position?

14 MR. STERNKLAR: The supplemental declaration says  
15 he's prepared to file fee apps if Your Honor orders it.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MR. STERNKLAR: It's a really -- the problem is,  
18 Your Honor, if Your Honor's view is that it's not required,  
19 then we'd be imposing a substantial burden on Your Honor  
20 simply to agree to it. We're prepared to agree to it, but we  
21 don't want to be presumptuous and say well, we'll do it, and  
22 now you're got to deal with this problem.

23 It's -- so it's up to you. We'll do it either way.

24 THE COURT: All right. So, what is the United  
25 States Trustee's position on that? What is the benefit to the

1 estate of reviewing fee applications between the insurer and  
2 its counsel?

3 MS. BACHTELL: Paula Bachtell for the U.S. Trustee.

4 Your Honor, the UST would like the opportunity to  
5 review the time entries that would be provided by the  
6 applicant. I understand that the source of funds for payment  
7 is someone other than the estate, but reasonable fees are part  
8 of the expectation in the Bankruptcy Court. It's something  
9 that we're prepared to do; we're willing to do it. I can't  
10 speak for others' interest in participating in that exercise,  
11 but we would like to.

12 And my understanding of the situation in speaking to  
13 my colleagues and Mr. Sternklar prior to the hearing was that  
14 the parties were prepared to engage in that activity. So it  
15 was with that information that I explained to the Court that  
16 the UST has no objection to the retention, and was relying on  
17 the business judgment of the Chapter 11 trustee in moving  
18 forward with the amended application. And so I would ask that  
19 the Court allow a provision that requires the filing of fee  
20 applications and the UST is ready, willing, and able to review  
21 the fee apps when filed.

22 Thank you.

23 THE COURT: Thank you.

24 I see this in two -- I see two different goals to be  
25 served by these fee applications, one of which seems to me we

1 can do without, and the other one seems to be more important.  
2 The one that seems to me that we could do without is a  
3 determination of the reasonableness of the fee. That is  
4 between Harris Beach and the insurer, and to the extent that  
5 the insurer creates difficulties for Harris Beach, that Harris  
6 Beach thinks are inappropriate, then I suppose Harris Beach  
7 can always come to this Court and ask that its payments be  
8 made from the estate, reserving to the estate the right to  
9 seek reimbursement from the insurer.

10 So whether or not the fees are reasonable or not,  
11 seems to me in the first instance to be a matter between  
12 Harris Beach and the insurer. And it makes sense that both  
13 keep careful records with respect to their own position.

14 The other goal of the fee application, one that  
15 usually it's not focused on, is as a record of what Harris  
16 Beach is doing. And to the extent that Harris Beach is  
17 working for the estate, then it seems to me that a careful  
18 disclosure of what Harris Beach is accomplishing is a  
19 worthwhile endeavor, particularly when there's a question of  
20 it being paid by somebody else.

21 And so my inclination is to require Harris Beach to  
22 make disclosure of its time as would any professional  
23 rendering services to the estate, but not asking for a ruling  
24 on its fees unless it chooses to have the Court review the  
25 relationship between Harris Beach and the insurer.

1                   How does that sit with you, Mr. Mikels?

2                   MR. MIKELS: Your Honor, I'm concerned -- well, a  
3                   few concerns. The first is that there's always a balance in  
4                   terms of the risks of disclosure of fees because they give  
5                   away issues of strategy. And this happens all the time in  
6                   bankruptcy cases --

7                   THE COURT: But you don't have to disclose the fees.  
8                   You just have to disclose the --

9                   MR. MIKELS: No, I was talking about what he's  
10                  working on --

11                  THE COURT: I know. But he doesn't work for you.  
12                  He works for the --

13                  MR. MIKELS: No, no, I understand --

14                  THE COURT: He works for the Chapter 11 trustee.

15                  MR. MIKELS: But we have a common interest in the  
16                  defense of these actions because the claims against the estate  
17                  that in the first instance, they'll be claims that we may have  
18                  to indemnify the estate on, subject to whatever rights we have  
19                  on coverage issues. So we have a commonality of interests in  
20                  terms of how these claims that are being defended are  
21                  resolved. And we are required, at least so long as we have  
22                  the obligation to cover the defense costs -- which of course  
23                  we're doing -- and so therefore we have a common interest with  
24                  the estate in not disclosing and Mr. Fern not disclosing his  
25                  strategy and so forth.

1           Now, as I said, this is always an issue in  
2 bankruptcy cases because I've made a career, as have many  
3 other people before you, and as you did before you were a  
4 judge, of making those kinds of disclosures. And we got sort  
5 of used to them. But the reason that we did is because it was  
6 a balance. On one hand, we had the risk of giving too much  
7 information to the adversary, and on the other hand, we had  
8 the overriding concern and the very important concern of  
9 making sure that bankruptcy estates weren't overpaying fees,  
10 and that made it worth, on balance, requiring the detailed  
11 disclosure.

12           In this case, that balance doesn't exist as long as  
13 we're paying the defense costs. And therefore I would say  
14 that the risk of giving information to adversaries would be  
15 prevailing because there's no countervailing balance, because  
16 we're not protecting the bankruptcy estate against fees. And  
17 in Your Honor's case, In re Plant about ten years ago, it's a  
18 Chapter 13, but you made it clear that what was overriding  
19 about fee applications and in that case, you, I believe, made  
20 a secured creditors counsel file fee applications because they  
21 were looking for reimbursement from the estate. And you were  
22 quite clear that if you're looking for reimbursement from an  
23 estate, there is an overriding concern that the fees be  
24 reasonable and the fee application should be filed.

25           That doesn't exist here; it's the mirror image of

1 that case. Until and unless he's ever looking for  
2 reimbursement for his fees from the estate, then that priority  
3 concern doesn't exist and the issue of disclosure of strategy  
4 and so forth, to me, becomes paramount because he's got a  
5 whole bunch of adversaries in litigation, all of whom will be  
6 reading the fee applications if, in fact, it's required.

7 So we would prefer that, since we have a commonality  
8 of interest with the estate in the defense, we would prefer  
9 that as long as we're paying the defense costs, that this kind  
10 of disclosure not be made to the adversaries because there's  
11 no advantage to doing it --

12 THE COURT: Who do you see as the adversaries?

13 MR. MIKELS: The people he's defending against: the  
14 claimants.

15 THE COURT: Okay. I understand.

16 Anyone else?

17 All right. Mr. Sternklar, would you send me an  
18 order which approves the Harris Beach employment, that  
19 requires Harris Beach to file quarterly disclosures of time in  
20 the case, in the type of detail that we expect in 2016-1 of  
21 the Local Rules, but that the disclosure is to be sent only to  
22 the United States Trustee, the Chapter 11 trustee, counsel to  
23 the Chapter 11 trustee, counsel to the unsecured creditors'  
24 committee, and counsel to the plaintiffs' steering committee,  
25 absent further court order; and also that the Court will not



1 rule on the reasonableness of the Harris Beach fees, absent a  
2 request for that ruling from either the insurer or from Harris  
3 Beach? Okay?

4 MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 MR. MURPHY: Your Honor?

6 THE COURT: Mr. Murphy?

7 MR. MURPHY: Yes. Your Honor, Harry Murphy for  
8 Barry and Lisa Cadden. Your Honor, with respect to the  
9 supplemental affidavit that Mr. Sternklar referenced --

10 THE COURT: Oh, yes, I'm sorry.

11 MR. MURPHY: -- you were going to get to that before  
12 you make a --

13 THE COURT: Right.

14 MR. MURPHY: -- ruling.

15 THE COURT: Thank you. I assume that Mr. Sternklar  
16 can get that to you in the next couple of days. If it says  
17 something that you think is disturbing, then please file a  
18 motion for reconsideration, within the fourteen-day  
19 reconsideration period. All right?

20 So the default will be, if you do nothing, then  
21 you're satisfied; if there's something about it you don't  
22 like, then you'll file such a motion and that'll be set for  
23 hearing.

24 MR. MURPHY: Your Honor, can you direct  
25 Mr. Sternklar when he'll serve that supplemental affidavit,

1       so --

2               THE COURT: Oh, he'll get that to you by Friday.

3               MR. MURPHY: By Friday next week?

4               THE COURT: By Friday this week or next week?

5               MR. MURPHY: This --

6               MR. STERNKLAR: If I can have a moment, Your Honor?

7               MR. MURPHY: Monday fine with us, Your Honor.

8               THE COURT: Monday's good. Okay?

9               MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

10              THE COURT: You needn't put that in the order; just  
11 send me the amended -- the revised order with the supplement;  
12 get that to Mr. Murphy and his colleagues representing the  
13 individual defendants; and if they're unhappy, I'm sure  
14 they'll tell me. All right?

15              MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

16              MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Your Honor.

17              THE COURT: Thank you.

18              MR. STERNKLAR: Two down. Your Honor, now, if we  
19 could turn our attention to the bar-date motion. This is a  
20 motion that in most cases is ministerial. Nothing seems to be  
21 ministerial in this case. The trustee requests the  
22 establishment of a bar date, for all the usual reasons: He  
23 needs a bar date so that he knows what the claims are; he  
24 needs a bar date so that he can prepare and file a disclosure  
25 statement, making adequate disclosure about what the claims

1 may be; he needs to know the claims so he can file a plan,  
2 which will be the vehicle through which he hopes those  
3 personal-injury claimants will actually get paid.

4           So, overlaid on that was the memorandum opinion by  
5 Judge Saylor on the transfer of motions -- excuse me --  
6 transfer of civil actions, where he made it clear that the  
7 establishment of an early bar date might go a long way towards  
8 resolving the remaining issue that he left open in the case,  
9 which is whether and to what extent he should transfer cases  
10 in state courts where neither NECC nor any of its affiliates  
11 were named as parties, and that if those defendants, by the  
12 bar date, filed a claim for indemnification, contribution --  
13 or any other claim, I suppose -- he left open the possibility  
14 he would transfer those matters to the MDL. As we've made  
15 clear in numerous filings, consolidation of these actions in  
16 the MDL is a core component of the trustee's strategy to reach  
17 a global settlement with all parties as soon as possible so we  
18 can get money to these people as soon as possible, at the  
19 lowest cost.

20           Your Honor, originally we filed the bar-date motion  
21 asking for a bar date, on September 20. We provided that we  
22 would give actual notice of the bar date to known and  
23 reasonably ascertainable creditors. We provided that we would  
24 publish notice in USA Today, the national edition. We also  
25 had a procedure in place to protect the confidentiality of

1 information, on those claims, about claimants' personal health  
2 matters. We also had -- and that, we believe, was sufficient  
3 to meet all our statutory obligations as well as our  
4 due-process obligations to these people, to provide both  
5 actual notice to known creditors and constructive notice to  
6 unknown creditors.

7           Going further, we had a procedure in the motion,  
8 where we asked Your Honor to enter an order directing the  
9 parties we call the notice intermediaries -- these are the  
10 clinics, the healthcare providers, who administered the NECC  
11 products to their customers and patients; we don't know who  
12 those people are, but we do want them to have notice of the  
13 bar date. And we arranged a procedure that we requested Your  
14 Honor approved whereby we would ask Your Honor to require that  
15 the notice intermediaries make an election: They can either  
16 send notice to everyone who received an NECC product within  
17 the two years prior to the filing, or they could turn over to  
18 us on a confidential basis the names and contact information  
19 of these people so that we could send those people notice as  
20 well.

21           Since we filed those pleadings, and in light of the  
22 numerous objections that have been filed, and in light of  
23 observations made at other hearings in this case, we filed in  
24 our response to the objections our proposed fix to the  
25 problems that seem to have arisen. That proposed fix extended

1 the bar date to October 8 -- October 15 from September 20th;  
2 it provided for publication not just in USA Today but in  
3 various local publications in the localities where these pain  
4 clinics and healthcare providers are located and where these  
5 products were administered. We also, with respect to the  
6 notice intermediaries, agreed that, and we proposed that,  
7 instead of being required to send notice to or give us the  
8 names of all patients who received any NECC product in the two  
9 years to the filing, that it be limited to those people  
10 reasonably expected to have suffered an injury, and those are  
11 the people identified as having received product in three lots  
12 identified by the Centers for Disease Control as having caused  
13 harm.

14 Certainly others who received other products are  
15 free to file a claim but, in terms of the obligation of the  
16 notice intermediaries, they either provide notice themselves  
17 or turn over the names. We've limited it to those people.  
18 Not only did that limitation, in our view, limit this process  
19 for the notice intermediaries and the burden on the notice  
20 intermediaries solely to those most likely to have suffered  
21 harm, but it also corresponded with the identities of the  
22 recipients of the recall notices that many, if not all, of  
23 these notice intermediaries previously were required to  
24 provide to these people by the federal government.

25 So this list should be readily ascertainable,

1 readily available. There shouldn't be much burden.

2 We also changed the form of the notice, to make it  
3 more consumer-friendly. We also limited who the information  
4 will be shared with. There's a concern, which I believe  
5 you'll hear from some of the people on the telephone about  
6 that this -- the identities of the potential creditors not be  
7 made available to some -- not be made available generally, be  
8 limited only to those who have a need for that information to  
9 provide notice to -- of the bar date, and to administer these  
10 cases. Obviously, all of these provisions would be subject to  
11 alteration upon motion to Your Honor and the entry of an  
12 additional order upon whatever grounds Your Honor decides to  
13 change the order, if such grounds exist.

14 We think that these changes have resolved most, but  
15 not all, of the objections by the notice intermediaries. And  
16 there are three classes of objections here: There are the  
17 notice-intermediary objections, which, in terms of number, are  
18 clearly the largest number of objections; there are issues the  
19 U.S. Trustee has raised, although they have not filed a formal  
20 objection; and last, there's the objection filed by the PSC,  
21 which is truly a horse of a different color and has its own  
22 unique issues, which I'll get to in a moment.

23 The remaining objections, Your Honor -- remaining  
24 issues, I think, in the notice-party objections, that are not  
25 resolved by the accommodations we're proposing to make, are, I

1 believe, the following: One, the notice intermediaries object  
2 to being forced to give notice without being reimbursed for  
3 their costs to do so. The trustee's view is that he's not  
4 requiring them to give that notice; it's an accommodation  
5 anticipating that many of them are going to feel uncomfortable  
6 having a third party give notice to their patients. They want  
7 to control that process; then they will have to bear the cost.  
8 If for any reason, including cost, they prefer not to give the  
9 notice, then they can simply give the information to the  
10 trustee.

11           You'll see from the objections, they're all over the  
12 map. Some of the notice parties object, on the grounds of  
13 patient privacy and HIPAA, that they can't give us that  
14 information and, therefore, they exclusively want to give the  
15 notice themselves. Others complain they shouldn't have to  
16 give the notice, that they want to give us the information.  
17 We simply will give them an election.

18           The HIPAA objection, Your Honor, we believe, is  
19 misplaced, for the reasons we said in our response. HIPAA  
20 clearly contemplates that disclosure can be made pursuant to a  
21 court order. There are different kinds of court orders. Most  
22 of the objections focus on what's called a qualified  
23 protective order, which is, under the statute -- under --  
24 excuse me -- Federal Regulations, a specific protective order  
25 issued in litigation, in response to a subpoena. And then

1 there's a separate provision that says any order; you can --  
2 if a court orders it, you can disclose it. We think the  
3 bar-date order is such an order. We think that, so long as  
4 the confidentiality restrictions we have in place are deemed  
5 sufficient, and we believe they are, the order provides all  
6 the authority that -- under HIPAA, that these notice  
7 intermediaries need to turn over this information.

8 If the notice intermediaries choose to give notice  
9 themselves, they will have to certify to the trustee that  
10 they've done so, but they will not have to disclose the names  
11 of the people to whom they sent the notice.

12 So with respect to the objection of cost, we think  
13 they have an election, and we think the trustee shouldn't be  
14 put in the position of having to monitor at that level the  
15 costs incurred and then reimburse people if they decline to  
16 turn the names over and instead prefer to send the notice  
17 themselves.

18 Second objection is largely by a contingent of  
19 notice intermediaries based in Maryland, that the bar date is  
20 too soon, that it should at least extend out till the  
21 expiration of all statutes of limitation under nonbankruptcy  
22 law, for the assertion of claims. And for obvious reasons,  
23 Your Honor, we can't keep this case open, nor should we be  
24 required to keep this case open, for years and delay payment  
25 to creditors concomitantly for an extended period of time to



1 address that issue. This is -- I'm unaware of any bankruptcy  
2 case that has ever kept a statute of limitations open till the  
3 expiration of the last possible statute of limitations.

4 The third issue that's been raised is that, well,  
5 why should the notice intermediaries give us the names; we can  
6 go to various state or federal governmental agencies and get  
7 the names. Well, the short answer is these people have it.  
8 These are the same names to the people -- the people that gave  
9 the notice -- the recall notices to. This should not be  
10 burdensome. This should not be difficult. The burden on the  
11 trustee of having to go through a state-by-state or federal  
12 process to try to get access to this information is  
13 potentially, at least, too severe to justify imposing that  
14 obligation on the trustee.

15 Finally, the -- I believe, the last remaining  
16 objection is to the absence of an affirmative exculpation in  
17 the order, for those who comply with the order. And I think  
18 it's self-evident: If you comply with the order, you're not  
19 going to have liability. So I don't know that we need  
20 anything further on that point, other than perhaps a sentence  
21 stating the obvious: If you comply with the order, you won't  
22 have liability. We've only asked people to make commercially  
23 reasonable efforts. Again, we're talking about mailing a  
24 short notice to people whose names and addresses should be  
25 readily available to them. But again, if they don't want to

1 do that, the order certainly authorizes them, under HIPAA and  
2 otherwise, to make that information available to the trustee.

3 Even if the order were characterized as an order  
4 that requires the notice intermediaries to give notice -- I  
5 don't believe it is; nevertheless, I believe that would be  
6 appropriate. Rule 2002(a)(7), on its face, authorizes the  
7 Court to direct who will give notice; it says the clerk, or  
8 some other party as the Court may direct, shall give notice.  
9 So 2002(a)(7) is a specific subsection that deals with notice  
10 of the bar date. Rule, I believe, 9007 gives the Court  
11 general authority to regulate the form and manner of notice.

12 So I don't think there is a serious argument that  
13 Your Honor lacks the authority to require it, if one  
14 characterizes that order as requiring it, which, again, the  
15 trustee believes it does not; it simply provides for an  
16 election.

17 The UST had three issues, Your Honor, they've raised  
18 with me informally; the first is -- and in no particular  
19 order, the first is that we put in the bar-date notice,  
20 consistently with Local Rule 3002-1, that 503(b)(9) claim --  
21 502(b)(9) claims, for administrative claims for goods and  
22 services -- goods rendered -- provided to the debtor within  
23 the twenty days prior to bankruptcy -- that date was set by  
24 Local Rule as sixty days after the first date set for the  
25 creditors' meeting, unless the Court orders otherwise. The

1 U.S. Trustee wants the Court to order otherwise and provide  
2 the general bar date for those claims.

3 I'm aware of Your Honor's unpublished opinion in JJ  
4 Donovan where I believe you interpreted that Rule and the  
5 interplay of that Rule on 9006(b)(6) as providing that the  
6 Court doesn't have the power to do that but does have the  
7 power to allow for untimely-filed claims of that nature, upon  
8 a showing of excusable neglect. Again, the trustee's  
9 preference is just simply to leave the Local Rule as it is,  
10 because that's out there. But at the end of the day, it's  
11 more important we get final resolution of the issue, than  
12 anything else.

13 THE COURT: I thought I heard you say this now two  
14 ways. What is the trustee's preference: that I extend it, or  
15 that I not extend it?

16 MR. STERNKLAR: I think the trustee's preference is  
17 you not extend it.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. STERNKLAR: But I don't know that's -- how  
20 seriously -- strongly felt -- I mean, I guess --

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. STERNKLAR: -- it's easier that way. The Rule  
23 is what it is, and people know what it is and -- or if they  
24 don't, they should. We're not creating ambiguity or conflict,  
25 but the U.S. Trustee has asked for that, and I did say I'd

1 raise it with Your Honor.

2 The second issue the UST has raised is it wants some  
3 changes to -- which I believe are unobjectionable and modest,  
4 to the bar-date notice, to make clear that untimely-filed  
5 claims may nevertheless still be allowed under certain  
6 circumstances. And Ms. Bachtell's proposed some language and  
7 I'm confident we can work that out, and that will be  
8 unobjectionable.

9 The third issue is probably the most difficult;  
10 concerns the U.S. Trustee's concern that we are proposing that  
11 the proofs of claim and the addenda remain confidential. The  
12 U.S. Trustee recognizes that the agenda should remain  
13 confidential, but it's concerned, in its view, this is a -- in  
14 his view, this is a public process and that the actual proofs  
15 of claim should be made available.

16 We've explained that our concerns with that issue  
17 are that people shouldn't put medical information on the face  
18 of the claims, but they might. And we're expecting tens of  
19 thousands of claims. It is not a simple exercise to review  
20 them for redaction. And there's also a concern that the  
21 identities of these claimants not be widely distributed.

22 So what we are prepared to do, and I believe the  
23 U.S. Trustee is agreeable to this, is ask our notice agent to  
24 prepare a spreadsheet or list that simply has initials or some  
25 moniker that says this is a claim, this is the amount, this is

1 the nature of the claim -- it's a tort claim or some other  
2 claim -- and this is the priority -- general unsecured or  
3 something else -- and that that list be made available to the  
4 public.

5 The trustee's concern was that that list contained  
6 enough information so someone can identify claims they might  
7 need more information on; and I think identifying them as tort  
8 claims or some other claim provides that, in this case,  
9 information. And we'd be prepared to amend the order to  
10 provide for that.

11 Finally, we get, Your Honor, to the PSC objection,  
12 which is truly wide-ranging. At its core, regardless of what  
13 was intended, what that objection would result in is the  
14 wholesale supplanting of the trustee by the PSC. Despite what  
15 the PSC argues, this is not a class action; this is not -- if  
16 it were, we wouldn't need Rule 7023 to deal with class  
17 certifications in adversary proceedings. These are -- this is  
18 a process governed by very specific statutes and rules and  
19 case law that, while it certainly has some superficial  
20 similarities to a class action, is not the same thing as a  
21 class action. And they don't always serve the same purposes.

22 So the PSC's approach that this is just another big  
23 class action and should do what we do on all the other big  
24 class actions is: (a) wrong; (b) reveals a fundamental  
25 misunderstanding of how this process works and what its role

1 is in this process, compared to the role of the trustee; and  
2 three, would result in the PSC getting to make decisions and  
3 having discretion that, I submit, the Code and the law imposes  
4 on the trustee to make.

5 PSC wants two bar dates, not one: It wants a bar  
6 date for personal-injury claimants and a bar date for someone  
7 else. They don't say when the bar date should be for the  
8 personal-injury claimants, but the implication is it should be  
9 way, way out in the future. They want -- and that seems to be  
10 a concern for unknown and future claims.

11 This is an issue that the Code addresses. As Your  
12 Honor noted earlier, the definition of claims is broad. We  
13 understand, as part of a plan, we're going to have to address  
14 in some fashion how we propose to treat claims for which  
15 symptoms may not have arisen yet, if any, or in other ways  
16 that haven't manifested themselves. But that's not a bar-date  
17 issue; that's a plan issue.

18 We're going to have to set a bar date at some point,  
19 no matter what. We believe the notice regime we get will  
20 identify those claims. But it proves too much to say, 'People  
21 who don't know they have a claim need to get notice of a bar  
22 date for a claim they don't know they have, even if they get  
23 the notice.' They don't know it, they don't know it.

24 So to extend out the bar date some indefinite long  
25 period of time to see how many more claims get manifested,

1 whether they get manifested, truly injures those seriously  
2 injured who have suffered claims, who'll have to wait to get  
3 their money for these somewhat speculative contingent  
4 potential claims to emerge in the future. That's not to say  
5 they're not creditors. That's not to say we don't have to  
6 deal with it. But it's not a bar-date issue. We have to set  
7 a bar date.

8           Moreover, this bar date is almost a year after NECC  
9 terminated its operations. Everybody -- as one of the  
10 objecting parties, the Dr. O'Connell Pain clinic objection at  
11 docket number 356 avers everybody who got product from the  
12 three lots knows it, and everyone -- it's inconceivable that  
13 there's anybody out there, given the wide publicity --  
14 nationally, regionally, in the health industry -- this debtor  
15 has received, that there is a larger substantial -- perhaps  
16 any creditors who received any product, who either won't get  
17 actual notice of this or won't be covered by the publication  
18 notice. It's hard to imagine there's anyone who doesn't know  
19 that they haven't been affected but, for that reason, Your  
20 Honor, we can't have an extended open-ended bar date; that's  
21 an argument for no bar date at all.

22           The PSC doesn't like the trustee's notice agent,  
23 Donlin Recano; it wants to hire its own notice agent. Now,  
24 originally it said it wanted to hire its own notice agent to  
25 handle different issues in the MDL, notably, gathering medical

1 records and things that are peculiar to the MDL. Now they  
2 want a wholesale change; they want us to get rid of Donlin.  
3 They cast aspersions on Donlin Recano's credibility because  
4 the debtor originally selected Donlin Recano.

5 Your Honor, we have no particular loyalty or -- to  
6 anyone. Donlin Recano's a nationally recognized, known  
7 noticing agent. The delay in this process and the -- and  
8 potentially the money, to simply switch forces now is -- in  
9 the trustee's judgment, makes that an unwise thing to do. And  
10 the PSC's arguments to the contrary-- well, I understand the  
11 PSC has a different view, but it's not the trustee.

12 The PSC complains that the notice does not  
13 specifically describe the potential effects in a plan of  
14 third-party releases. As we said, it is our expectation at  
15 some point we will have a global settlement, a component of  
16 which will be third-party releases that will inure to the  
17 benefit of those who make a substantial monetary contribution  
18 to the pot.

19 Your Honor, we don't have that plan, and this is not  
20 a disclosure statement. And in light of, indeed, opinions  
21 such as Your Honor's opinion in Clamp-All, I'm not sure how  
22 much we can or even should say about third-party releases in a  
23 bar-date notice. That's the kind of thing that, in order to  
24 be explained fully and thoroughly, needs to be included in a  
25 court-approved disclosure statement, and we're not at that



1 point yet.

2 So the fact that the notice -- the notice does say  
3 that creditors should be aware that if they don't file a claim  
4 they will not have claims against NECC, but whether they file  
5 a claim or not, it's possible the plan may prevent them from  
6 going after other third parties. I think that's as far as  
7 we're allowed to go, frankly, absent plan and a disclosure  
8 statement in describing what the consequences may be, because  
9 anything more we say starts opening up a door to a much larger  
10 disclosure, and we start resembling what would be in a  
11 disclosure statement, and I submit that's inappropriate for a  
12 bar-date notice.

13 The PSC complains that our direct notice is  
14 inadequate. They don't want to limit the obligations of the  
15 notice intermediaries to -- or the trustee to send direct  
16 notice only to those who received contaminated products from  
17 the three lots. They say we should defer to the PSC who, in  
18 the MDL, sent out some eighty-odd subpoenas where they want to  
19 gather the names of a broader -- much broader group of people  
20 from the notice intermediaries of former NECC customers. We  
21 should wait until that process plays out. We should then give  
22 direct notice to every one of those people.

23 The short answer is we think that is unduly lengthy,  
24 open-ended, costly, and we believe that our approach is  
25 superior and is more likely to get resolution of this case and

1 the names of these affected people who have the real claims  
2 quicker with less acrimony, with less fighting, with less  
3 litigation. But again, it's the trustee's role to make that  
4 decision, not the PSC's role to make that decision.

5           Its related complaint that our process interferes  
6 with the MDL discovery gets it backwards. We're indifferent  
7 to that discovery. They can do what they want in the MDL, but  
8 that's got nothing to do with what we do here in terms of  
9 identifying claimants for notice. And indeed, Judge Saylor  
10 has requested additional briefing on whether he even has the  
11 power under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that limit  
12 discovery to information recently calculated to lead to  
13 discovery of admissible evidence in the litigation, to use  
14 that process to get names and contact information to be used  
15 in the bankruptcy process to give notice. I'm not sure he has  
16 that power. But that he even asked the question shows why  
17 it's the trustee's duty, indeed, and power and obligation to  
18 move forward in this court without being limited by what the  
19 PSC is doing in the MDL.

20           Your Honor, so I believe what we've done is  
21 constitutional. I believe it provides due process. I think  
22 we've done more. The trustee nevertheless is prepared to do  
23 even more, if there's something that makes sense to do. The  
24 PSC has supplied the affidavit of Kinsella (ph.), someone who  
25 proposes to be an expert on noticing matters. And Kinsella

1 proposes a different noticing process. And what's interesting  
2 to note is Kinsella also explains that its background is in  
3 various cases.

4 Well, if you look at the list of bankruptcy cases  
5 that it's involved in, those are megacases. Those cases have  
6 a lot more cash available to -- and have a much broader  
7 constituency range of potential creditors than NECC has. If  
8 we had an unlimited pot and we had unlimited time, maybe we'd  
9 do something different, but we don't, nor do we know what this  
10 would cost, whether it would cost more or less than the small  
11 amount of money we even have on hand to do what Kinsella  
12 wants.

13 We don't think that what -- you know, what Kinsella  
14 proposes is not inherently good or bad, but under these  
15 circumstances, it's the trustee's judgment that it is  
16 inappropriate, that we don't have the money or the time to  
17 engage in the kind of class action based solicitation of  
18 claims that the PSC proposes will occur under the Kinsella  
19 proposal.

20 Finally, Your Honor, the PSC, perhaps in an  
21 overexuberant advocacy, alleges that by setting a bar date  
22 we're seeking to bar claims. We're not seeking to bar any  
23 claims; we're seeking just simply to do what Rule 3003(c)(3)  
24 says we're supposed to do which ask the court to set a  
25 deadline for claims. It's the trustee's view that it needs

1     that deadline.

2             The PSC complains we haven't disclosed to them the  
3     status of the trustee's negotiations with the insiders over a  
4     settlement and the time frame in which we think that's going  
5     to be completed. We have certain confidentially obligations,  
6     but those negotiations are moving forward. They're moving  
7     forward aggressively. The trustee is trying to bring them to  
8     closure as soon as possible. That we haven't disclosed the  
9     particulars of that to the PSC reveals more about what the PSC  
10    perceives its role to be compared to what the code says the  
11    trustee's role is. They've gotten all the information on that  
12    they're entitled to, and that we haven't said more isn't the  
13    reason not to set a bar date.

14            So, Your Honor, I suppose I'm prepared to answer any  
15    questions you may have, and after you hear from these people,  
16    perhaps I can have a very brief opportunity to give a final  
17    summation, if that becomes necessary. But we need a bar date.  
18    We think the bar-date procedures we've proposed are both  
19    constitutional and reasonable. We believe that we've resolved  
20    the bulk of the objections by the notice intermediaries. We  
21    believe the PSC's objection is not well taken and should be  
22    denied. And we would ask Your Honor to allow the motion.  
23    Thank you.

24            THE COURT: All right. We'll take a fifteen-minute  
25    recess to give Ms. Chambers there a break. All right.

1 (Off the record at 2:39 p.m.)

2 (On the record at 3:03 p.m.)

3 THE CLERK: All rise. Please be seated. The court  
4 is now in session.

5 THE COURT: All right, so I have the Chapter 11  
6 trustee's position with respect to the motion for the bar  
7 date. Does the creditors' committee wish to be heard?

8 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Sobol  
9 himself has a real time constraint and asked whether --

10 THE COURT: Wow.

11 MR. BALDIGA: -- he could --

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MR. BALDIGA: -- possibly go next, if the Court  
14 would permit?

15 THE COURT: Absolutely.

16 Mr. Sobol, go ahead.

17 MR. SOBOL: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: I thought you were on the phone, or  
19 going to be on the phone.

20 MR. SOBOL: That must have been --

21 THE COURT: No?

22 MR. SOBOL: -- a miscommunication --

23 THE COURT: Okay.

24 MR. SOBOL: -- in my office, for which I'll take the  
25 responsibility. And it won't happen again. I apologize for

1     that hassle, really.

2             So, cutting through the histrionics, I want to go to  
3     three very substantive issues; the first is the issue of  
4     notice to the injured victims, okay? I think that there's a  
5     shared desire to get as much notice out as we possibly can to  
6     the victims. The PSC thinks the following is a very  
7     straightforward necessary proposition in this case: that  
8     those people who received contaminated products from NECC  
9     receive direct written notice by a professional notice  
10    administrator and claims expert; we think that's a very  
11    straightforward thing. And our position in the papers, and  
12    I'll get into it --

13            THE COURT: Before --

14            MR. SOBOL: Yes.

15            THE COURT: Before I -- let me just interrupt you  
16    for a moment. Because this Court is going to rule on -- and  
17    pre-approve what the notice says, why can't any notice  
18    provider send out these notices?

19            MR. SOBOL: Any notice provider can. That's --

20            THE COURT: Okay.

21            MR. SOBOL: -- not our issue.

22            THE COURT: Oh, I thought you were --

23            MR. SOBOL: Yeah.

24            THE COURT: -- saying that it needs to be a notice  
25    provider who is familiar with these kinds of issues.

1 MR. SOBOL: Oh, no, no, no. I guess the distinction  
2 I'm drawing is whether it's Donlin or Kinsella or some company  
3 like that --

4 THE COURT: Right.

5 MR. SOBOL: -- versus clinics doing it.

6 THE COURT: I see.

7 MR. SOBOL: So that's one of our issues. So just  
8 let me drive right into that right now.

9 So we think that it should not be sent out by the  
10 clinics; it just should be sent out by a professional, whether  
11 Donlin or Kinsella, whoever, because you can track who it is  
12 that they're getting it. If you get a return letter, you  
13 could have somebody do something to be able to figure out  
14 where they live; we're going to get this back out to them.  
15 You have a record as to who it is you're sending out  
16 information to, so that if you don't get a claim and there's  
17 an application by the PSC or the creditors' committee that  
18 there be supplemental notice to those people, you know who  
19 they are. Right? It's all a very, very routine kind of  
20 thing. And there are reasons, as we've explained in our  
21 submissions, why it is that the clinics would be less prone  
22 and in a conflict position to do that, particularly if the  
23 notice is making clear to those people that they might have a  
24 claim against the clinic. So rather than having the clinic  
25 send it out, our position is very, very straightforwardly that

1 it should be by a claims expert.

2 And so whether or not the names are coming from an  
3 order that you enter or an order that Judge Saylor enters, and  
4 I'll deal with that just briefly in a few moments, is really  
5 not material to our ultimate real core desire, which is, these  
6 people need to get notice, that you have approved, from a  
7 professional claims expert, so that we can track  
8 professionally who's getting the notice, whether they need  
9 supplements, whether we can find them, are we going to  
10 actually create -- one of the things the PSC might do, on our  
11 nickel, is a phone bank so that we can follow up if people  
12 haven't filed a claim or, if their claim information is  
13 insufficient, to tell people that. Right? It's all very  
14 simple. That's the core part of our -- and we remain at a  
15 difference of opinion with the trustee as to how to do that.  
16 That's one substantive position.

17 A footnote to that, just to clarify something that  
18 may not be clear in either the presentation of the lawyers or  
19 in the materials so far, before I get to my second point, this  
20 footnote is that, just so you can understand, months ago, the  
21 PSC, through me, sat down with the trustee's office and we  
22 looked at this issue of notice and how we're going to do this.  
23 And frankly, I thought that what we had made arrangements for  
24 was that the PSC would take on the job, because we're going to  
25 be conducting discovery anyway, of the clinics, to also be



1 seeking the names, for multiple purposes; right? Remember  
2 that one of the issues in this case is that NECC and the  
3 clinics should have had these people's names to begin with,  
4 not names like Mickey Mouse or Donald Duck or whoever it is  
5 they were writing who are falsified names or backdating names  
6 or not having sufficient names. They should have been keeping  
7 these names all along; it's one of the things the PSC wants to  
8 find out about: who actually has the list around. But we sat  
9 down, me and the trustee sat down, and decided that that would  
10 be an effective way -- the most effective way, through Rule 45  
11 and through Judge Saylor, for that process to do that, because  
12 it would be central enforcement and it would be one  
13 consolidated pursuit.

14 Now, I was surprised to find out, when the bar-date  
15 motion was filed, that the trustee wants to do his own thing  
16 too; right? At some level I don't care about it, so long as  
17 the victims don't pay for it; right? But it does, frankly,  
18 seem that there's a little bit of now -- there's one effort by  
19 the trustee to get names, and there was an effort by us, in  
20 the Rule 45 context, in front of Judge Saylor, to get the  
21 names, and it seems to me that that's frankly a little silly  
22 and should be worked out.

23 But I'm going to move on to the second issue anyway,  
24 okay? The second issue is, what is it that the notice should  
25 say about this notion that there may be what are functionally

1     nondebtor releases; they're really channeling injunctions but  
2     which effectively cut off the rights of these victims -- not  
3     against NECC but the debtor, because that's going to happen no  
4     matter what -- but against, like, if they're real life, like  
5     the clinic, with their doctor, with a testing company, with a  
6     company that's supposed to make the clean room or the company  
7     that was supposed to be cleaning the clean room, right?, all  
8     these other people. What is it that's planned now, if  
9     anything?

10           Now, on the one hand, we're agnostic to what the  
11     decision is, but I think it's important to make an observation  
12     about what the decision is. If today the bar-date notice is  
13     not intended to provide constitutional do-not notice to these  
14     people, in a real way this is a real problem. This is, in a  
15     real way, if you don't file a claim in this bankruptcy now,  
16     your rights against your clinic may be out; we don't know,  
17     because there isn't a deal to get together, but it may be out  
18     the door, or against your position, or against the test  
19     company's blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Right?

20           If it's intended to do that, then it needs to say,  
21     like, right out of the gate, in very clear language, and we  
22     don't think that it does. We were provided something that we  
23     think does it in somewhat the best way you sort of can do it  
24     now, and the reason I say it that way is because there are no  
25     deals yet, so you don't even know defendants you're talking

1 about, whose claims might be waived right now, functionally.  
2 But we've done the best we can, in our proposed notice.

3 Now, on the other hand, I've heard this said by the  
4 trustee and I can completely understand it, and I've heard it  
5 today too: 'No, no, no, no, we're not trying to deal with a  
6 plan today. We're only dealing with the bar date. And if we  
7 have a plan -- and we plan on having a plan that has nondebtor  
8 releases, channeling injunctions against as many people as we  
9 possibly can, including the insiders, and we're going to do  
10 that later on; and at that point we're going to need full  
11 disclosure in the context of a plan.' Well, then my question  
12 is, well, okay, but then you're going to have to send notice  
13 to everybody, right?, not just those people who filed a claim,  
14 because now you're barring those people's -- everybody's  
15 rights against these new nondebtors that weren't disclosed  
16 previously.

17 So we're not just talking about the population of  
18 claimants in a vote on a confirmation plan; you're going to  
19 need to send out notice to everybody before you have a  
20 channeling injunction that says, 'Too bad, your rights against  
21 your clinic are now gone,' which, okay, again, from our point  
22 of view, sort of agnostic. If -- in fact, we encourage having  
23 a nondebtor release program here; we think it will maximize  
24 the value to the estate, to be sure, and we're doing all sorts  
25 of things to do that. But if we're going to do that later on,

1 and if we're going to have all that disclosure later on and  
2 we're going to have lots of expense later on, then it really  
3 does ask the question: Why don't we wait to do that notice  
4 for NECC's bar date for the victims, then, too, rather than  
5 having to do another round of notice in a situation where  
6 we're trying to conserve valuable resources?

7 Now, if I understand the logic, then, it's, well,  
8 wait a second, we've got to be doing something now. And I  
9 understand that. Our position on the PSC's position is you  
10 should enter a bar date for nonvictim claims and that our  
11 position is that with respect to this -- again, this is the  
12 way this logic goes -- if we're going to be doing a big notice  
13 program later on with a nondebtor release program, and then  
14 the question is why not wait, and you can do your bar date now  
15 for nonvictims. And then it raises the question, well, do we  
16 need any information today or in October about the victim  
17 claims, in order to do these negotiations or do something  
18 else? And near as we can tell, frankly, the answer's no.

19 In other words, it's not critical path to getting  
20 this case done, from our point of view, from what we can see,  
21 to have a bar date now for victims if we're going to go  
22 through that notice program again later anyway. It's not  
23 critical path, because we need to put together the deals,  
24 because we're going to have to put together a plan, I mean,  
25 because we're going to have to go through a notice process

1 anyway, and none of that requires knowing anything about the  
2 victims now.

3 Now, why do we keep on saying that? Well, because  
4 NECC is insolvent; because there are 700 and more illnesses  
5 that have been documented, and 61 deaths and exposures that  
6 are out there; and the value of the insurance, by any  
7 participant that we've spoken to so far, recognizes  
8 accumulatively it's not going to come close to compensating  
9 everybody.

10 So at one level, it's immaterial whether or not one  
11 person's claim is big or another person's claim is small, or  
12 whether you have forty-five of the sixty-one deaths in the  
13 case right now, or only twenty-five of the sixty-one deaths,  
14 because you're going to do a notice program later on when  
15 you're confirming the plan, to bring those people in, if  
16 that's what you're planning on doing later on.

17 So just again, to make the second point clear, we  
18 are not philosophically, in terms of this issue of nondebtor  
19 releases, against the notion of doing a notice now that  
20 adequately protects people's rights, although I'm not sure we  
21 can really get enough done there on it, simply because what  
22 you do -- again, what we're doing is so oblique, frankly; your  
23 rights may be lost against anybody under any circumstances  
24 involving anything, right?, that we end up going down that  
25 way. So be it, and hopefully that'll be enough. But on the

1 other hand, if, as the trustee expects, we're going to have to  
2 do full-blown notice later on, we don't see a purpose, in  
3 terms of critical path, for having to do a bar-date notice now  
4 for victims.

5 The third point I wanted to address, and this is  
6 frankly one of the smaller ones but it seems to have raised  
7 the ire of the trustee a little bit, is that anticipating  
8 these issues about the importance of notice and the  
9 acquisition of names and how we're going to deal with all of  
10 this stuff, both the plaintiffs' steering committee and the  
11 creditors' committee began a process sometime -- I think it  
12 was in mid-May or something like that -- to do a competitive  
13 bidding process to find out who was going to be the best and  
14 the cheapest at a variety of things, which includes being the  
15 black box -- the lockbox, if you will -- that gets these  
16 names, de-duplicates the names, sends out the notice, sends  
17 out following notices to track people down, deals with census  
18 information later on, houses medical information for purposes  
19 of allocation, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And we  
20 invited the Donlin firm to participate; the Donlin firm  
21 refused to participate. The creditors' committee and the PSC  
22 made a joint recommendation to the trustee to use Kinsella,  
23 whose bid was markedly less than the professional services  
24 being -- of Donlin. And for reasons that, frankly --  
25 actually, for reasons that escape me because the reason I've

1     only been given is timing, the trustee chose to reject that.

2             Now, the timing issue I don't think is -- should --  
3     is or should be a problem because, again, the notice hasn't  
4     been approved yet, let alone sent out, let alone names coming  
5     back and back-identifying. It is the case that the subpoenas  
6     that we've issued to eighty-two recipients, seventy-some-odd  
7     of which are the clinics, does indicate to people that they  
8     are to return information to the Kinsella firm.

9             The final thing I should indicate is that there is  
10    some question as to not the intent but the follow-through by  
11    the clinics when responding to the CDC's request to give a  
12    notice of the -- what's been called here as the recall notice.  
13    It's not clear the extent to which the clinics were successful  
14    in an effort of sending recall notices to everybody. There's  
15    no declaration before you right now, either by the trustee or  
16    by me, in terms of the adequacy or inadequacy of that process.

17            I will represent to you, however, within my  
18    discussions with various people, and this is at best hearsay  
19    from other lawyers telling me what it is that they were told  
20    by other people in various states, is that it's mixed results  
21    and in some places that the return of the letters was almost a  
22    third, as the address -- unknown or something to that effect;  
23    that in some other places, it wasn't letters that went out to  
24    people; there were phone calls that were made to people, and  
25    in some places the population of to whom it is that was to be

1     contacted has been reported back to me in varying ways; in  
2     some places it's anybody who got a contaminated product  
3     between March and October of 2012, and in other situations  
4     it's anybody who the clinic has reason to think was injured by  
5     the MPA. It's because of issues like that that we thought it  
6     important to have a court order under which each clinic has  
7     been served formal court process to which to respond and to be  
8     obligated in terms of providing information.

9             The final thing I just want to throw out is that  
10    it's been observed that there is obviously an overlap in terms  
11    of the tort issues that Judge Saylor has been dealing with and  
12    the bankruptcy issues that you've been dealing with. And one  
13    of the things that's clear overlap is this bar-date issue, as  
14    it certainly affects the material rights of tort claimants  
15    under bankruptcy laws. And at least I'll say that I have  
16    suggested, whether this is crazy or not, but at some  
17    proceeding when we're dealing with these issues, that the  
18    courts -- plural -- might consider holding a joint session  
19    where we're dealing with these issues, because it might be --  
20    frankly, it might be more fun -- I can put it that way -- but  
21    maybe also more efficient, because of the need to toggle back  
22    and forth.

23            If Your Honor -- I have never done this in my thirty  
24    years of practicing law, but I have kept some people waiting  
25    for me for a couple of hours. If the Court has any questions



1 for me, I'm happy to answer them; otherwise --

2 THE COURT: No, I don't.

3 MR. SOBOL: Okay.

4 THE COURT: I don't. Thank you.

5 MR. SOBOL: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Thank you.

7 Is there someone else on the phone, who's going to  
8 be representing the PSC committee?

9 MR. SOBOL: There was a Mr. Lipton, I think, or  
10 Mr. Sobor (ph.).

11 MR. LIPTON: Yes, Your Honor, this is Marc Lipton;  
12 I'm on the phone still.

13 THE COURT: Okay, good. All right.

14 Safe travel, sir.

15 All right, does anyone else -- I'm sorry,  
16 Mr. Baldiga, you wanted to be heard.

17 This is Mr. Baldiga on behalf of the official  
18 creditors' committee of the bankruptcy case.

19 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you, Your Honor. For the  
20 record, William Baldiga, Brown Rudnick, for the creditors'  
21 committee.

22 Your Honor, we support this motion. And like  
23 everything else we do, the context is important. We are seven  
24 months into this case, as quickly as that has gone by in some  
25 respects. And it's an important case in the sense that you

1 heard from Mr. Galligan earlier: There's real suffering here.  
2 And this is not a class action where I might get a fifty-  
3 dollar check next year or the year after, for participation in  
4 whatever happened. But the recompense here is critical to the  
5 ongoing care of some very, very sick people. And we're also  
6 dealing -- so time is critical. And in some ways I'm  
7 embarrassed that we're seven months into the case, just asking  
8 for a bar date.

9 This process -- and we're here today after what has  
10 been a full two-, almost three-, month process of discussions,  
11 almost daily, among the trustee, the PSC and the committee.  
12 It's fair to say that the committee wanted in March to file  
13 the motion that you have before you; we held off because the  
14 trustee, to his credit, asked that the committee expend every  
15 conceivable effort in bringing the PSC on board, and the  
16 trustee joined us in trying to do that, and we spent ten weeks  
17 trying to do that; we were successful in certain respects. A  
18 lot of what you've read is the product of a lot of very good  
19 cooperation, but we were unable to get that on board.

20 We did reach an agreement on June 6 with the PSC  
21 that they would fully support a motion brought before this  
22 Court for a bar date of around October 15, and that would  
23 apply to all claims. That's an agreement that we did reach in  
24 writing. And it gives us pause that something different than  
25 that is suggested.

1           We -- there is very good reason for a bar date here,  
2           and two primary ones. First, it drives the settlement  
3           process. We at Brown Rudnick have been here before, as  
4           perhaps other parties; certainly Harris Beach, who you heard  
5           from previously, in other cases, including the ephedra cases.  
6           It is really very difficult to expect potential defendants,  
7           potentially culpable parties, and especially the insurers, to  
8           cut significant checks without knowing the universe of claims  
9           in front of them, as the Bankruptcy Code requires or the Rules  
10          require, under oath, certified, with some real level of  
11          detail. We all know, from 60 Minutes and news reports and  
12          everything, what happened here, reports of deaths and so  
13          forth. But people don't write big checks unless they have the  
14          details in front of them; that's only responsible. Everyone  
15          who writes checks reports to someone else who would expect  
16          that.

17                 Second, and this is critical, and in the context of  
18          the -- what you heard Mr. Sobol say, we are here in the  
19          context of a dual proceeding, the MDL. And it's impossible to  
20          fully appreciate the importance of the bar date now and the  
21          immediacy of it, without appreciating what has happened in the  
22          MDL.

23                 The -- there was a motion by the trustee, in May, to  
24          centralize all pending actions relating to NECC, including  
25          those that did not name NECC specifically, for strategic

1 reasons perhaps, in the MDL, for efficiency and, incredibly  
2 important, to avoid the multiplicity of indemnification claims  
3 arising in cases such as the ephedra cases; those are the  
4 claims that could really break the back of any case. And  
5 every time there's an expenditure by one of the clinics and so  
6 forth, there's a potential indemnity claim; those are  
7 contractual here. There're some common-law indemnities but,  
8 for the most part, as you heard from the trustee very early in  
9 the case, most or all of these clinics and hospitals, and so  
10 forth, have contractual indemnities from NECC as part of their  
11 normal purchase of product.

12 The PSC has issued eighty-two subpoenas to clinics  
13 about a month ago. There have been more than thirty, perhaps  
14 forty, objections in the MDL. Every piece of paper has a  
15 cost. The cost of that process is considerable; we hope not  
16 overwhelming. We believe that, as of this date, there has  
17 been nothing yet produced by way of the names and addresses  
18 that Mr. Sobol referenced. We would like that not to be the  
19 case, we would like that to have all come in easy with no  
20 objection, but nothing is easy.

21 In the ideal world, we would have those lists and  
22 this would be that easy, but there are legitimate objections,  
23 including by many people on the phone, and those have to be  
24 played out. You heard Mr. Sternklar say earlier Judge Saylor,  
25 even after receipt of those and a full hearing, has asked for

1 supplemental briefing; there's further hearings. We're not  
2 going to get what we need there. Hopefully we'll get some of  
3 the eighty-two. But waiting till the last person complies  
4 with something that is subject to that much legal give-and-  
5 take is a very, very long process.

6 Judge Saylor expressed concern as to the  
7 centralization with respect to certain claims, those that  
8 didn't name NECC in his ruling, in his written decision -- and  
9 the Court may have seen it; I hope you have; if not, we can  
10 certainly put it on the docket on this proceeding.

11 THE COURT: I've read it.

12 MR. BALDIGA: -- is that concerned with comity and  
13 other important considerations that did not transfer into the  
14 MDL cases that did not name NECC or one of its affiliates, and  
15 understanding explicitly that that could allow -- he wouldn't  
16 be able to stay those and so there could be -- it could drive  
17 indemnity costs significantly. And Judge Saylor suggested to  
18 the trustee, and the trustee heard him loud and clear and  
19 announced to the committee and to the PSC, coming out of that  
20 hearing -- or after reading that decision, 'We need a bar date  
21 and we can't wait any longer for you, OCC, to try to get the  
22 PSC fully on board.' And the reason is, because with a bar  
23 date, if one of these clinics or others with indemnification  
24 rights file a proof of claim, it's no longer a theoretical  
25 claim but something that could justify Judge Saylor exercising

1 his jurisdiction.

2 So a bar date will drive the settlement process that  
3 we're all here -- we don't need to be in Chapter 11 if we're  
4 not going to have the settlement process; Chapter 7 would  
5 suffice. And the bar date is a necessary tool to the success  
6 of this case where time is important. Secondly, it will  
7 reduce claims substantially, and that's critical. This is a  
8 very limited-universe case.

9 The PSC has argued a few things -- I think Mr. Sobol  
10 narrowed them significantly in his comments, which is  
11 appreciated -- and has argued last week -- came close to  
12 arguing again today, but clearly in last week's transcript  
13 said that 'We are here with a de facto class action.' And  
14 Judge Saylor corrected them and said, 'No, that is a horse of  
15 a different color. This is not a class action.' And the  
16 argument persisted that there was a case that Mr. Sobol's firm  
17 was involved in, the Relafen case -- I don't -- I'm  
18 phonetically taking it from the transcript -- in which there  
19 were 4,000 timely claims filed; there was then -- authorized  
20 some further outreach. An additional 350,000, or so, claims  
21 came in deserving payment, and that's when Judge Saylor said,  
22 'Well, this is a much different case.'

23 Mr. Sobol's first point was -- and this is really  
24 the primary driver; he said, 'I think we can all agree that we  
25 should do as much notice as possible.' We don't think that's

1     what the standard is. This case -- as much notice as possible  
2     would cost more cash than this estate has. We don't have the  
3     funds. We don't have Merck on the other side here. We can't  
4     afford to do as much notice as possible. It's a balancing  
5     act. I think the trustee has done a great job balancing  
6     competing demands between economy of the estate and that type  
7     of theoretical class-action type of ideal where funds are  
8     unlimited.

9             And Mr. Sobol's specific point is, 'We suggest that  
10    everyone who got a contaminated product should get a direct  
11    mail notice.' That's the specific. Well, what does that  
12    mean, getting down to brass tacks? First, none of us really  
13    know how many contaminated products there were. We believe,  
14    and the CDC has said, there were three contaminated vials of  
15    MPA; maybe 14,000 people got that -- got a shot from one of  
16    those. And so we're looking at, we think, a universe from  
17    people who may have taken an injection from a contaminated  
18    vial, up to 14,000 or so; could be much less than that, but  
19    that's the -- would seem to be. But that's one drug.

20            If you look at Exhibit 5 to the PSC's objection  
21    here, they're pretty explicit about what they just asked the  
22    Court to do, because we talked about 14,000 people getting  
23    direct mail notice, but they want direct mail notice to all  
24    people who may have gotten a contaminated drug. At Exhibit 5,  
25    the PSC is pretty explicit; there were 1,900 different types

1 of drugs that may or may not have been contaminated, at 457  
2 facilities, in virtually every state in the country. If there  
3 were 14,000 who got MPA, how many people got the other 1,900  
4 drugs? Are we talking about a million notices? Three million  
5 pieces of mail?

6 It's -- it would be nice to be able to be in the  
7 abstract where there is a large party at the other end who  
8 could permit us to give every conceivable notice, but we  
9 can't, so we do have to deal in the practical realities. The  
10 trustee has been -- "patient" is a good word -- to take our  
11 comments, take the PSC's comments, in more hours of meetings  
12 and calls and drafts. What you have before you is probably  
13 the twenty-fifth, or so, draft of a bar-date notice; it's not  
14 been for lack of trying to come to a consensus.

15 I do want to comment on the DRC part of this. Well,  
16 Mr. Sobol is correct; we did join with the PSC in a  
17 competitive process to see whether DRC or someone else would  
18 reduce their cost, and it does seem like we can get there.  
19 And -- but we would do it at the official committee with the  
20 trustee and not over the back of the trustee.

21 There's time to do that. All this Court would be  
22 asked to do today is approve DRC as the mail drop for these  
23 notices. There is plenty of time ahead of us, in a couple  
24 months, three months ahead, to change horses in that regard.  
25 There's a lot of work to do with these claims; a lot of it



1 will be done by the trustee; a lot of it will be done by the  
2 committee, in terms of analyzing them, trying to figure out  
3 settlement. The plan has been already in the works, but  
4 there'll be plan balloting and so forth. Maybe that won't be  
5 DRC that does that work, and -- but we know how to bring a  
6 motion to the Court on due notice and do that, and we'll give  
7 DRC a further opportunity to be competitive in that regard.  
8 But this bar-date notice does lock in DRC.

9 I do want to mention -- so we're fully supportive of  
10 what the trustee has done here; it may not be perfect; it does  
11 use the estate wisely. We -- it encourages the filing of a  
12 claim by those who have claims. It does not do what the  
13 further Kinsella drafted notice would do, which is actually  
14 encourage the filing of a claim by someone who has non-  
15 personal-injury claims but who may have suffered distress. We  
16 think, while there are some class actions where that is  
17 appropriate, it invites what the PSC may term millions of,  
18 literally, claims by people who may or may not have been  
19 exposed to a drug, possibly, and may have had legitimate fear  
20 that it just doesn't know whether it ever got an injection or  
21 was exposed to something that may or may not have been  
22 contaminated or caused any harm whatsoever. But we don't  
23 think it's our job, at the estate level, to encourage everyone  
24 who has any conception in that regard, to file a claim and see  
25 what happens; that would make this case come to a crawl, and

1 those people who have had such tremendous suffering will be  
2 waiting years for any type of recompense.

3           There is one point that Mr. Sternklar and I were  
4 talking just a moment ago that we may have to come back to the  
5 Court on, which is the amended order suggested by the trustee  
6 with respect to -- on his supplemental response, or whatever  
7 it is, provides, at the request of some of the people on the  
8 phone, some of the clinics, that the members of the creditors'  
9 committee, acting in their fiduciary capacity, do not get to  
10 see the information that comes in on the bar date; that's a  
11 legitimate concern today. Part of the dynamic here is that  
12 there is a real concern, and you see it in Judge Saylor's  
13 transcript, of client-trolling and, for these addresses to be  
14 made public, give rise to a real concern that there are  
15 lawyers out there who may want to take a huge mailing list and  
16 do the type of solicitation which none of us would be proud  
17 of.

18           And so we have committed to the trustee that,  
19 because there are lawyers who represent clients on our  
20 committee of course, just like on the PSC, that we would have  
21 it be at attorneys' eyes -- that is, Brown Rudnick eyes --  
22 only, until the bar date comes and goes, but that once the  
23 information comes in, it's critical that the members of the  
24 creditors' committee, who are very experienced lawyers in the  
25 ephedra cases and in other cases like this, get to see the

1 substantive information, as will then all the people on the  
2 defendants' side and so forth, if that's what we need to do to  
3 make a settlement.

4 So we -- that one part of the order we do take issue  
5 with; it's a very minor part in the universe of things here.  
6 And hopefully with the clarification that the members won't  
7 see that information till the bar date has come and gone,  
8 assuming we're dealing with October 15th -- that's a  
9 reasonable period -- we are not going to do client-trolling on  
10 our committee. And that concern is completely alleviated once  
11 the bar date has come and gone. Thank you.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 MR. BALDIGA: Any questions for the committee, Your  
14 Honor?

15 THE COURT: No.

16 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you.

17 THE COURT: United States Trustee?

18 MS. BACHTELL: Thank you, Your Honor. Paula  
19 Bachtell for the U.S. Trustee. Good afternoon.

20 Your Honor, the U.S. Trustee understands and  
21 appreciates the Chapter 11 trustee's efforts to obtain a firm  
22 bar date to give clarity and to provide proper notice, but we  
23 have requested amendments to the proposed order that was  
24 submitted to the Court under document number 372; I'd like to  
25 address them in reverse order as presented by Attorney

1 Sternklar. First, Your Honor, with respect to paragraph 6,  
2 the UST has requested a more narrowly tailored relief with  
3 respect to information that is treated as confidential in  
4 order to address the rebuttable presumption that the public  
5 has a right to access to proofs of claims filed by creditors  
6 concerning their own claims; these are documents filed with  
7 the Court and, therefore, they are judicial records.

8 Your Honor, it's extraordinary to the U.S. Trustee  
9 for anyone to request that the face of the proof of claim not  
10 be made part of the public record. I will say to you that we  
11 are in agreement that with respect to the addendum which is  
12 separately referenced in paragraph 6 and which I understand  
13 will include the very personal information about the  
14 claimants' medical situation, the UST does understand that  
15 that information, the addendum alone, is properly kept  
16 confidential.

17 But with respect to the face of the proof of claim,  
18 we have requested that that POC itself be made available to  
19 the public. The reason for that, Your Honor, is it's our view  
20 that it allows for an opportunity for a party-in-interest to  
21 request further information from the Court, for cause; it'll  
22 assist in the objection to claim process and voting  
23 calculations; but most importantly, Your Honor, it'll provide  
24 the public with a more complete understanding of the judicial  
25 system and a better perception of its fairness.

1           We did also discuss the issue of a list. Your  
2           Honor, our first request would be that the POCs themselves be  
3           made part of the public records, which is consistent with any  
4           other case that we've ever been involved with, but that if the  
5           Court is inclined to consider the substitute option of a list,  
6           I would submit that the UST will actively negotiate and  
7           participate in what information would be provided on the list.  
8           And it would be our request that essentially the same  
9           information that you would see on a proof of claim itself be  
10          made part of the public record in that alternative manner.  
11          But I just would like to make clear to Your Honor that our  
12          first request is that the face of the POC be made public,  
13          consistent with other bankruptcy cases. Your Honor, that's  
14          paragraph 6.

15                 The next issue: related paragraph 20, which just  
16          dealt with the barring of claims; and the specific language in  
17          that particular area raised a concern about late-filed claims.  
18          And so the UST has suggested language for the trustee to  
19          consider that would insert the word "a timely claim" in  
20          paragraph 20 and also make reference to the debtor and its  
21          estate being forever discharged if the claim is not paid in  
22          Chapter 11, so that untimely proofs of claim, in the event  
23          that there are funds available after the payment of timely  
24          filed proofs of claim, would be available to those claimants.

25                 And then last but not least, Your Honor, the UST did

1 raise a concern regarding paragraph 11(f) and the "provided,  
2 however" language. I understand from Attorney Sternklar that  
3 he was taking that language from -- and the particular date  
4 reference therein is tied to the language in our Local Rule  
5 3002.1, which begins with, "Unless otherwise ordered by the  
6 court". I will say, Your Honor, that the UST has requested  
7 that there be a general bar date for all creditors. In our  
8 view, it was either important not to add superfluous  
9 information into the context of a notice for bar date, or it  
10 was just more fair and easy to have a general bar date for all  
11 creditors, which is what we're accustomed to seeing.

12 If the Court is predisposed to not diverging from  
13 the Local Rule, which Attorney Sternklar did share with me  
14 that you had made that ruling in an unpublished decision -- I  
15 was unaware of it -- I have to defer to the Court on your  
16 feelings on that matter. But the request --

17 THE COURT: I --

18 MS. BACHTTEL: -- has been made.

19 THE COURT: I certainly understand all the arguments  
20 that have been made about --

21 MS. BACHTTEL: Um-hum.

22 THE COURT: -- about victims not being able to  
23 identify the full extent of their injuries, and so forth. But  
24 those who would take advantage of 502(b)(9), they're the --

25 MS. BACHTTEL: 50 --

1 THE COURT: -- trade.

2 MS. BACHTELL: 503(b)(9)?

3 THE COURT: 503(b)(9).

4 MS. BACHTELL: Yeah. Yeah.

5 THE COURT: I'm sorry. They're just --

6 MS. BACHTELL: No problem.

7 THE COURT: They're the trade.

8 MS. BACHTELL: Um-hum.

9 THE COURT: Why should they get any better treatment  
10 than any other trade creditor in any other case?

11 MS. BACHTELL: I understand that that's your  
12 concern --

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. BACHTELL: -- Your Honor. And if that's your  
15 ruling, it's acceptable to the UST.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MS. BACHTELL: Thank you.

18 THE COURT: Thank you.

19 Does anyone on the telephone wish to be heard?

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Steve  
21 Grossman, who represents Inspira Health Care (sic) and Inspira  
22 Medical Centers.

23 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: I want to thank you, first of all,  
25 for allowing the courtesy of us being able to appear by phone

1 today. I also want to extend thanks to the trustee for  
2 reaching out to Inspira and, I believe, some other healthcare  
3 providers, with respect to the objections that were filed, and  
4 for listening and trying to resolve those objections; and we  
5 feel we've done a very good job at that.

6 What I'd like to address, and I feel a need to  
7 address, are many of the issues that have been raised by the  
8 PSC and some of the confusion that that may be -- that may  
9 have created as to what is the universe of potential claims.  
10 What the PSC has not been clear about and what forms, I think,  
11 the basis of their objection, is who are the victims and the  
12 potential claimants. The PSC believes alone and, I believe,  
13 since the trustee has agreed to what has been presented in the  
14 amended motion, or that is their motion, and the creditors'  
15 committee supports that motion, it's the PSC alone that  
16 believes that notice, actual notice, should go to any patient  
17 who got any NECC product, and that's not correct.

18 As the trustee established, the potential claims  
19 against the estate relate to three specific lot numbers of  
20 NECC MPA that were administered after May 21st, 2012 and only  
21 three other NECC products, with nine specific lot numbers,  
22 produced after June 6, 2012. That's the universe of potential  
23 claims; nothing more. There's no evidence that any other lot  
24 number, any other product, has been contaminated or that any  
25 other patient may be at risk according to the CDC. No



1 healthcare provider should be required to provide the names of  
2 patients who were not exposed to those three lot numbers or  
3 those nine specific lot numbers of the other products.

4           The PSC is attempting in this court, as they've  
5 tried to do so, so far, and failed to do so in the MDL, to  
6 create claims where none exist, by obfuscating the medical  
7 literature to suggest that there is an unknown latency period  
8 for those who receive contaminated NECC products. What the  
9 PSC has failed to inform the Court about is that all of the  
10 studies on which they rely and cite in their opposition  
11 evaluated patients exposed to only the three specific lots of  
12 MPA administered after May 21st, 2012; no other products, no  
13 other lots. As such, these studies have nothing to do with  
14 any other NECC product as the PSC suggests, or in any way  
15 provides the basis for them to be able to believe that notice  
16 should go beyond that or that there would be potential claims  
17 beyond those particular products.

18           Inspira's a hospital that's been treating patients  
19 tied to the outbreak relating to these three specific lots of  
20 MPA, and continues to do so today. Inspira's on the  
21 frontlines of treatment of these patients that have been  
22 affected by what NECC has done. But the patients being  
23 treated and those who the CDC assessed were at risk, which  
24 includes those who may be at harm in the future, relate only  
25 to those three specific lot numbers of MPA administered after

1 May 21st, and no more.

2 As we said in our brief, but I think it's important  
3 to reiterate today, if the CDC or any federal, state or  
4 health -- or local health authority had evidence or believed  
5 in any way that the contamination or the outbreak or potential  
6 patient risk was linked to any other product or lot number  
7 other than the three lot numbers of MPA and those nine  
8 specific lot numbers of the three other products, they would  
9 have required Inspira and every other clinic to notify each  
10 patient to ensure that those patients were evaluated and for  
11 the CDC to assess the risk. That did not and has not  
12 happened.

13 And to respond to the PSC's comment today in court  
14 that they have no idea of the success of notice, the CDC Web  
15 site suggests -- or it's on the CDC Web site, to my knowledge,  
16 that ninety-nine percent of those patients were contacted. To  
17 provide actual notice to any patient who ever received any lot  
18 of MPA or any other product in the last two to five years, or  
19 to anyone who did not get an injection from one of the three  
20 specific lot numbers of MPA, would be reckless and harmful to  
21 those patients.

22 If there is a concern about patients as the PSC  
23 suggests, it wouldn't be advocating to cause them harm by  
24 notifying them, implicitly telling them that they are at risk  
25 for meningitis or related infections, serious issues, when

1 there's no evidence -- and indeed the PSC has provided no  
2 evidence to this Court or to Judge Saylor in the MDL court --  
3 that these patients are at risk and, therefore, potential  
4 claimants. We agree with the trustee that actual notice, if  
5 any, should be limited to those patients who may be at risk  
6 and who may file a claim if they are provided notice, which  
7 are those patients that were administered one of the three  
8 specific lots of MPA after May 21st, 2012.

9 We'd also like to address some of the comments the  
10 PSC made about requiring more information about third parties  
11 who might be responsible, or at least should be in the notice  
12 for third parties who could be -- where plaintiffs could be  
13 potentially barred, or claimants potentially barred, against  
14 third parties other than the debtor. The notice provisions  
15 the PSC requests aren't designed to do anything other than, we  
16 believe, to help the PSC, in the plaintiffs bar (ph.), obtain  
17 new clients. The waiver (ph.) consumer-friendly or pointing  
18 to language that suggests that there's claims against the  
19 hospitals, clinics or doctors, including mislabeling or  
20 malpractice claims, is beyond any provision we're aware of  
21 that's required for the notice.

22 Interestingly, and despite what the PSC represented  
23 today in court, there's no other category of entities  
24 specifically named, other than healthcare providers. There's  
25 no mention of testing facilities, cleaning companies, sales

1 companies, or any affiliated defendants such as the owners and  
2 principals of NECC, that are named in the new notice that the  
3 PSC drafted. Such language, we believe, is unnecessary to  
4 advise patients of their potential claims against the debtor.

5 Our recommendation, which we believe is agreed upon  
6 by the trustee based on what has been submitted to the Court,  
7 and apparently the CC -- or the creditors' committee also  
8 supports given their representation today in court, is to  
9 simply identify any other potential parties as simply any  
10 other party, which Inspira did as an accommodation to the  
11 trustee in lieu of fighting to have the entire reference  
12 removed entirely.

13 Since the inception of the MDL and the creation of  
14 the creditors' committee, the PSC has pushed very hard to move  
15 this case at lightning speed against the healthcare providers,  
16 and advocated an early bar date in order to have leverage  
17 against healthcare providers, to come to the settlement in  
18 exchange for some type of release or channeling injunction.  
19 Yet today the PSC says it's not critical to go forth in that  
20 fashion. I think they take that different position today for  
21 the bar date, for personal-injury claimants, or at least  
22 trying to separate out the personal-injury claimants that they  
23 not be set -- or the bar date not be set as to them or be  
24 deferred, because they don't want Your Honor's ruling to  
25 impact their attempt to obtain a treasure trove of patient

1 information in the MDL, through the use of eighty or more  
2 subpoenas to healthcare providers, for information on patients  
3 that have no connection to, and never received any injection  
4 of, one of the three specific lot numbers.

5 If Your Honor limits that scope here to those  
6 affected lots, the PSC won't be able to continue their fishing  
7 expedition in the MDL or even here. There has been enough  
8 harm and the potential for harm to the patients who actually  
9 received one of the three specific lots of MPA after May 21st,  
10 2012; we believe there's no need to create more based on  
11 speculation and the desires of the plaintiffs' steering  
12 committee.

13 Finally, we object to the creditors' committee  
14 request in their objection that notice intermediaries, like  
15 Inspira, include a cover letter with the notice that they may  
16 be ordered to provide. Not only should there be no cover  
17 letter included; it should clearly not include one with the  
18 wording "the creditors' committee suggests", which is, "This  
19 office, clinic or facility -- select one -- has been directed  
20 to send you the enclosed bankruptcy notice, based upon our  
21 records showing you were administered or prescribed a product  
22 made by New England Compounding Center. This notice explains  
23 who you can contact for more information or to answer your  
24 questions about the notice," end quote.

25 First, there's no reason for any cover letter, as

1 the notice documents are sufficient. The patients who  
2 received or may have received an injection of one of the three  
3 specific lots of MPA were already contacted by Inspira and  
4 other health -- and the other healthcare providers who are on  
5 this phone likely, as required by the CDC and other federal,  
6 state and local health authorities. Some were contacted on a  
7 weekly basis, and those who were asymptomatic were contacted  
8 on a monthly basis through March 2013. This pattern and  
9 required contact with patients is unique to this case.  
10 Getting the notice, proof of claim and the addendum as  
11 drafted, without more, as a result of NECC's bankruptcy, is  
12 not going to come as a surprise or be the first time that  
13 these patients are reminded that they may be at risk because  
14 of their exposure to NEC's (sic) MPA.

15 As such, there should be no cover letter required,  
16 whether sent by a claims administrator or Inspira or other  
17 healthcare providers. If the Court does require that the  
18 cover letter be included, it should be amended to be -- to  
19 more accurately reflect the patient receiving it. Right now  
20 it is not limited to the three specific lots of MPA at issue.  
21 And the cover should not create a concern that other MPA or  
22 other NECC products could have harmed them, when there's no  
23 evidence as I described earlier.

24 Also, there's no reason to identify Inspira or any  
25 other healthcare provider in a cover letter, as it provides no

1 benefit to the patient or the recipient, and will invite calls  
2 or other inquiries to Inspira, which is, I don't believe the  
3 purpose. As such, we request that no cover letter be required  
4 at all, or revised to accurately reflect the patients who are  
5 being sent a notice, and not include any reference or  
6 identifying information concerning Inspira.

7 I think the last point the PSC made for a joint  
8 session is really not necessary. The scope of the claims and  
9 the potential claims are pretty clear.

10 For these reasons and for those set forth in our  
11 brief, as well as for the reasons the trustee has expressed,  
12 we respectfully request that the bankruptcy court issue the  
13 bar-date order contained in the trustee's revised notice, with  
14 the exception of the language including the identification of  
15 mislabeling or malpractice claims, as well as the naming of  
16 healthcare providers as an entity the patients may have a  
17 potential claim against. We also request that there be no  
18 cover letter requirement with the notice. Thank you, Your  
19 Honor.

20 THE COURT: Thank you very much.

21 MS. BACHTELL: Your Honor, Paula Bachtell for the  
22 U.S. Trustee.

23 THE COURT: Yeah.

24 MS. BACHTELL: May I make one final point?

25 THE COURT: Yes.

1 MS. BACHTELL: Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted  
2 to raise one other issue and it relates to Code Section 107  
3 and the public-access-to-papers provision. Your Honor, this  
4 is an instance -- I'm referring to the matter of the  
5 protection of the information placed on the face of the proofs  
6 of claim. Your Honor, I just want to submit to the Court that  
7 there's a general rule with respect to public records being  
8 open to examination under Section 107, and thus far there  
9 really hasn't been any discussion or offer of proof that would  
10 put the Court in a position to protect a person with respect  
11 to scandalous or defamatory matter contained in a paper filed  
12 in a case under this title. But I just wanted to raise that  
13 as well, as another reason that the information contained on  
14 the face of the POC should remain in a public realm. Thank  
15 you.

16 THE COURT: Thank you.

17 Anyone else on the phone?

18 MR. MEISLER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Ron Meisler  
19 of Skadden Arps. Your Honor, I represent Insight Health  
20 Corporation; we're one of the parties that filed an objection.

21 Your Honor, as a threshold matter, we believe that  
22 what the debtor is requesting of notice intermediaries, and  
23 that is, directing them to send notice or otherwise imposing  
24 upon them to do something, that's a mandatory injunction.  
25 And, Your Honor, I think it's been well established in case



1 law, and it's statutory, that for a debtor to seek a mandatory  
2 injunction or equitable relief, Rule 7001 applies, which makes  
3 this motion procedurally defective. And, Your Honor, even if  
4 they filed an adversary, there's no cognizable right to impose  
5 this kind of relief on a third party that has no property to  
6 the estate and that is otherwise not currently involved in the  
7 bankruptcy.

8 Your Honor --

9 THE COURT: You want me to write a decision that  
10 says that your client won't cooperate for technical reasons,  
11 won't send information to its patients who may have been  
12 harmed? Is that what you're looking for?

13 MR. GROSSMAN: Your Honor, I don't think that the  
14 debtor can ask from us, the third-party healthcare provider --  
15 I don't think they can ask for us to do anything at this  
16 point.

17 THE COURT: It's a lawyerly response, not a business  
18 one. Go ahead.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: Your Honor, look, we're bound by  
20 HIPAA and we've got certain requirements.

21 THE COURT: HIPAA doesn't apply. Go ahead.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Your Honor, what the debtor -- Your  
23 Honor, actually, I'm going to need clarification on the  
24 application to HIPAA, because if what they're looking for are  
25 patient contact information --

1 THE COURT: Keep on -- keep --

2 MR. GROSSMAN: -- we're --

3 THE COURT: Keep on going, counsel.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. Your Honor, the trustee  
5 likes to argue that 2002 is what applies and gives this Court  
6 the authority to direct us to provide notice. Your Honor,  
7 that's not what 2002 is meant for. 2002 is meant so that in  
8 the larger cases where the Clerk of the Court can't handle the  
9 claims and noticing, that this Court and courts around --  
10 bankruptcy courts around the country can direct a claims and  
11 noticing agent to assist, or otherwise puts that burden on the  
12 debtor in Chapter 11. It's not an obligation that should be  
13 imposed upon third parties.

14 Your Honor, it's also important to note that the  
15 debtor doesn't need third parties like us to go through our  
16 own books and records and to provide notice. The law is  
17 clear. The Fifth Circuit's opined on this. The Third  
18 Circuit's opined on this. The courts in this district have  
19 opined on this. The notice requirement is for the debtor to  
20 search his own records. But to ask us to search our records  
21 and to be in essence their agent, simply goes -- it goes too  
22 far. The debtor has publication notice; we think that's  
23 appropriate for those parties that the debtor doesn't have  
24 contact information in its own books and records.

25 Your Honor, put simply, we share the same skepticism

1 that Judge Saylor does. We do think that they've got a  
2 procedural issue. We think also that they've got a  
3 jurisdictional issue. In fact, if they were asking for this  
4 information pursuant to the subpoena, they would have to do it  
5 through the court in which -- the court that has jurisdiction  
6 over us and the other notice intermediaries; they couldn't do  
7 it straight out of the district court in Massachusetts.

8 Your Honor, they also try to compare us to banks and  
9 brokers in the solicitation context. I think it's important  
10 to note that that's not comparable. The banks and brokers are  
11 already obligated to provide notices to their customers who  
12 hold debt or equity with the banks and brokers. So we don't  
13 think that that analogy applies.

14 Your Honor, for those reasons, we believe that this  
15 motion, with respect to its request on notice intermediaries,  
16 is improper and should be rejected.

17 Your Honor, to the extent that you see our objection  
18 on this ground differently, we have three remaining issues  
19 with respect to the request. Two of our -- we have five  
20 issues to begin with; two have been resolved. By the way, the  
21 trustee has changed its procedures. The two have to do with  
22 the scope; we said the scope was too broad. Now that the  
23 trustee is limited to three specific lots, we're okay with  
24 that. With respect to the form of notice and requiring  
25 clarification, again, the trustee did clarify that. And the

1 three remaining issues are: reimbursement of expenses; a  
2 clear and specific statement that there's no liability on  
3 account of providing notice; and three, to the extent, again,  
4 that you disagree with our perspective that we cannot be  
5 directed, we would also request that there be a duty that a  
6 notice intermediary simply provide commercially reasonable  
7 efforts to identify the contact information of its patients.

8 Your Honor, just to touch on reimbursement of  
9 expenses, we think it's inappropriate that the debtor shifts  
10 the burden and the cost related to notice, onto the notice  
11 intermediaries. Donlin Recano -- it's a noticing agent, and  
12 they can't take advantage of what we perceive as HIPAA issues,  
13 to shift that cost and burden onto us and parties that are  
14 similarly situated.

15 Your Honor, I think the other two points are clearly  
16 stated in our objection, and with that, Your Honor, you've  
17 heard our perspective.

18 THE COURT: Thank you.

19 Anyone else on the phone?

20 All right, hearing --

21 MS. WEINER: Your Honor --

22 MR. LIPTON: Your Honor --

23 MS. WEINER: -- this --

24 MR. LIPTON: Your Honor, this is Mark Lipton for the  
25 PSC, and I'm not sure if you want to hear again -- I just

1 have, like --

2 THE COURT: Well, before I hear from you, sir, I  
3 thought I heard somebody else speak up.

4 MS. WEINER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Cara Weiner.  
5 I represent nonparty Erlanger. I respect the Court's time  
6 and, if you don't mind, I just have a couple of minutes, at  
7 most, of objections --

8 THE COURT: Go ahead.

9 MS. WEINER: -- that I wanted to raise and point --  
10 first, Your Honor, I do appreciate that the trustee reached  
11 out to us. We are in full agreement with the objections that  
12 he filed, docket number 372; they address our major concerns.  
13 Our position is a little bit different than some of the other  
14 healthcare providers, in that my client, nonparty Erlanger,  
15 did not receive any of the tainted medication; specifically,  
16 they did not receive the MPA nor any of the other drugs that  
17 may be considered tainted. At this point the only evidence of  
18 harm is from the three MPA lots, and my client didn't receive  
19 any of those lots.

20 Therefore, requiring my client to notify anybody is  
21 certainly outside the scope of what we think this bankruptcy  
22 is about. And moreover, our client is unable to identify  
23 patients that specifically received other lots -- other drugs  
24 from NECC. That is, as you'll see in our objection, our  
25 client did receive other medications from NECC and other

1 providers. We cannot differentiate necessarily what vendors  
2 we used to give certain adult patient medications.

3 Therefore, requiring us to give a list of patients  
4 who may have received NECC products but may have received  
5 products from a different vendor would be a violation of HIPAA  
6 and would be outside the scope of what this bankruptcy is  
7 about.

8 If you have any questions for us, Your Honor, I'm  
9 happy to answer them. But in the interest of this Court's  
10 time, I'll stop talking.

11 THE COURT: Thank you.

12 Anyone else other than Mr. Lipton?

13 Okay, Mr. Lipton, go ahead.

14 MR. LIPTON: Well, I want to thank you again, like  
15 everyone else, Your Honor, for allowing me to do this from my  
16 office rather than traveling to Boston. I think that it's  
17 paramount for all the lawyers here that we're trying to  
18 preserve the assets of the estate.

19 THE COURT: Well, if you had gone to Boston, it  
20 would have been the wrong place anyway.

21 MR. LIPTON: That's true. That's true as well, Your  
22 Honor. So, saved double time.

23 So let me -- I'm going to be brief. I'm going to  
24 try very hard not to reiterate or repeat anything.

25 The PSC's position is -- supported our papers as it

1 relates to a bar date, and at least specifically as it relates  
2 to the victims. I do think that the Court has the authority  
3 to differentiate between the victims of the NECC debacle and  
4 the businesses, with regards to setting the bar date. And I  
5 just want to point out that from the very beginning of this  
6 bankruptcy, it was represented by NECC, with the original  
7 trustee that they chose and then the trustee now, that this  
8 entire process is being designed to move for the benefit of  
9 the patients who have been victimized. And I don't want to  
10 lose sight of that, and that's why I think that, unlike even  
11 in normal bankruptcy, it's important to bend over backwards to  
12 make sure that the right people get notice of -- before we  
13 start looking to bar claims.

14 I heard Mr. Baldiga talk a lot about that we need to  
15 maybe -- to cut down -- create a bar date so that we can close  
16 a number of claimants and move this thing forward. But at the  
17 end of the day, it's really about cutting out potential  
18 injured people, and that is really who this -- the reason why  
19 we're in this bankruptcy court, at this point anyhow.

20 The rest of those comments I'll leave to the brief.

21 I want to just touch on a couple points that I did  
22 not hear notice -- or raised, I mean. And the issue of the  
23 notice to third-party -- or notice intermediaries, and I think  
24 the gentleman from Skadden Arps mentioned it, but I also heard  
25 it before, the complaint that the trustee or the debtor should

1 be responsible for notifying the patients. Your Honor, I need  
2 to make sure that you're aware that many of these clinics,  
3 certainly not all but many of them -- and I happen to be from  
4 Michigan, so I can speak specifically about the documents that  
5 I've seen from the Brighton clinic, which is one of the two  
6 clinics in Michigan from whom at this point the majority of  
7 the patients are coming from. And in fact, Michigan has more  
8 injured people, according to the CDC, than any state. At  
9 least one of those clinics, when it was submitting its forms  
10 to NECC for medications, was not providing any patient names.  
11 Now, that was a violation by the debtor, and it was a  
12 violation of applicable law by the clinic, but it means that  
13 the debtor does not have in their possession the names of a  
14 majority of the Michigan victims, and the Michigan victims  
15 that represent the majority of the known identifiable --  
16 identifiably sick people from the lot -- from the MPA lot.

17 So there's a good reason to -- at least as it  
18 relates to the clinics that violated the law by not providing  
19 the names of their patients to NECC, to require them to -- if  
20 you were to impose a bar date at some point, whether it's now  
21 or later, on the patients, to require them to in fact either  
22 give those names to the trustee or notify them themselves.

23 And the second point I want to just make mention of,  
24 and we haven't really discussed it all either, has to do with  
25 the addendum. So I do understand someone argued and made it



1 clear that the addendum -- I think this was the U.S.  
2 Trustee -- made it clear that the addendum itself would not be  
3 a public record. But I want to point out that under all of  
4 the proffered rationales that I've heard and that were written  
5 about, none of them, at least now, require -- or should  
6 require a patient, or an attorney on behalf of the patient, to  
7 complete those lengthy addendums, because the information in  
8 there, by all the medical literature -- it's clear that no one  
9 knows today what these patients' condition is going to be even  
10 in the next two or three months.

11 I could speak as an attorney representing a number  
12 of clients who have thought that they were out of the woods,  
13 who then subsequently had relapses and have ended up back in  
14 the hospital and had surgery, when they thought that they had  
15 been treated already and had already made it through and put  
16 this behind them. So in -- the literature's already replete  
17 with information that the physicians don't know what the  
18 long-term effects are. If you require a patient, as part of a  
19 proof of claim in the next thirty, sixty or ninety days, to  
20 prepare and respond to this addendum, and then at the minimum  
21 ninety (sic) to six months after that, before a plan is in a  
22 position to be distributed, they're going to have to  
23 prepare -- complete those forms again, which, again, in the  
24 interest of reducing cost both to the victims and to the  
25 estate and also to the attorneys around the country who are

1 representing these people, it doesn't make sense to  
2 essentially have a snapshot today that is going to -- that is  
3 going to be required to be redone again.

4 So I would urge that the -- any order that you  
5 issue, if you decide to do a bar date as one bar date now or  
6 if you decide to split them up, you do not require the  
7 completion of an addendum until such time as there's actually  
8 money to distribute, which is going to be sometime after the  
9 bar date anyhow.

10 And I think the rest of the stuff has been covered  
11 in the briefs and by counsel, so I'm going to pause at that  
12 point. And I want to thank you again for your time.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Well done. All right. Let me  
14 start out by providing my perspective as to the delineation of  
15 the job that I have and the job that I think the district  
16 court has taken on. And I preface that by reminding those of  
17 you that are familiar with the Bankruptcy Code and Title 28 of  
18 the United States Code that any time that the district court  
19 chooses to do so, it may withdraw the reference from this  
20 court and deal with the whole ball of wax. Until and unless  
21 it does that, then the following delineation is, I think, what  
22 I'm doing and what I think the district court is doing, and  
23 the delineation is created not as a result of anyone's choice,  
24 as much as it is statutory and constitutional requirements.

25 The bankruptcy court's job here is to marshal the

1 assets of the estate, to approve a mechanism for distribution  
2 of the proceeds of those assets to allowed claims, and to  
3 liquidate claims that are neither personal injury nor wrongful  
4 death claims. Those are the primary functions of this court.  
5 The primary function of the district court, so long as it  
6 chooses to do so, as I indicated, is to liquidate the personal  
7 injury and the wrongful death claims. Frankly, I think I've  
8 got the better of the deal.

9 The parties differ on whether there needs to be an  
10 early bar date for the victims. I agree that there should be,  
11 not so much an early but an earlier, relatively speaking, bar  
12 date. The goal is to get everybody around the table, and I  
13 don't think that that can be appropriately done unless the  
14 victims are required to file claims.

15 Now, which victims should that be -- or I should say  
16 what persons should that be? And those should be those people  
17 who received products that the CDC said were contaminated.  
18 Not everybody that any NECC ever dealt with, and not people  
19 who, under any stretch of the imagination might have had some  
20 contact with NECC. The CDC has identified the contaminated  
21 lots. Those are the people who need the actual notice.

22 Again, those claims are not going to tell us very much.  
23 They're not going to give us very much information about the  
24 ultimate liquidation value of those claims. And if the  
25 district court wants to fashion some sort of a secondary

1 notice or to appoint some mediation intermediary in order to  
2 resolve these claims, I wouldn't be surprised. But this  
3 court's job is to get everybody around the table that should  
4 be around the table.

5 Now, the parties differ as to what the notice  
6 intermediaries should -- who they should be. Well, they  
7 should be those entities who administered the contaminated  
8 product. Again, not everybody who administered any NECC  
9 product over a stated period of time. They ought to be  
10 required to produce, for the Chapter 11 Trustee -- as well as  
11 the PSC, but I leave what should be produced for the PSC to  
12 District Judge Saylor. But they ought to produce a list of  
13 the names, the addresses, the last four digits of Social  
14 Security numbers, so that they can be separately identified  
15 for those with similar names, and what was administered to,  
16 when, and by whom. I really can't see anything else of value  
17 that would be put to good use.

18 The Chapter 11 Trustee ought to be sending the  
19 notices to all of those people, and that list, by each of the  
20 notice intermediaries, ought to be supplied in short order.  
21 The request for reimbursement for identifying the names of  
22 patients, who probably have already been identified to the  
23 CDC, has a level of arrogance that I won't even begin to  
24 address.

25 The PITWD -- and I think that the creditors'

1 committee called it something else, but the supplement, again,  
2 ought to be extremely limited because of its limited value.  
3 The notice should not identify any particular third-party  
4 targets. It's enough, it seems to me, if it says to the  
5 claimant that your failure to file a claim in the NECC case  
6 may affect your rights against parties other than NECC. That  
7 ought to be enough to give them a clue as to who those parties  
8 might be. And I think being more specific and identifying  
9 classes of likely third-party targets paints a target on those  
10 entities that is inappropriate.

11 HIPAA is not a problem. HIPAA contains the  
12 exception for information requested supplied by court order.  
13 In the order that I'm going to ask the Chapter 11 Trustee to  
14 prepare, we'll say that in the Court's view, HIPAA is  
15 satisfied by the terms of the order.

16 As for these different noticing agents, I think that  
17 the PSC, understandably, views this proceeding much  
18 differently than does this court. This is a case here about  
19 all of the creditors. The victims of these adulterated  
20 products are clearly the vast majority, and undoubtedly, the  
21 most sympathetic. But to have a separate noticing agent for  
22 the PSC, whose job it also is to collect claims and deal with  
23 plan votes, if that time ever comes, with respect to -- it  
24 simply creates confusion if we're going to have secondary  
25 notices, one for nonvictims and one for victims.

1           Accordingly, this court is happy to consider any  
2     change that the Chapter 11 Trustee and the creditors'  
3     committee in the bankruptcy case, with the advice of the PSC,  
4     recommends to change noticing agents, in the event that one of  
5     them is less expensive than the other. And the parties know  
6     how to file a motion seeking to substitute one notice agent  
7     for another. But that noticing agent must come from the  
8     bankruptcy court, which is responsible for a larger class of  
9     creditors than simply the victims of these adulterated lots.

10           I've already indicated my unwillingness to disrupt  
11    the 503(b)(9) deadline that is addressed in the Local Rules.

12           Just going down my list of the different issues that  
13    were raised, a number of the objections addressed the problem  
14    of statutes of limitations that might extend for periods well  
15    after the bar date. Well, frankly, that's what bankruptcy is  
16    all about. We don't wait for the statute of limitations,  
17    because that delays recovery for creditors. Creditors who  
18    have claims must state those claims. It's okay that they're  
19    unliquidated. It's okay that they're contingent. But they  
20    must identify the claims in order to participate with other  
21    creditors. Claims filed can always be amended, so long as  
22    they're not substantively different. So a creditor who has  
23    incurred loss as a result of one of these adulterated lots,  
24    and whose illness progressed thereafter, is always free to  
25    file an amended claim. And even untimely claims may be

1 allowed under the Pioneer -- the Supreme Court's Pioneer case,  
2 in Chapter 11 cases, so long as the failure to file the claim  
3 was by virtue of excusable neglect and the estate has not been  
4 unduly prejudiced.

5 And so I have no problem with telling these  
6 creditors that in fact if they fail to file a claim they may  
7 be barred from doing so thereafter. But rather than using the  
8 words "shall be forever barred", I'd either prefer "may be  
9 barred", or if "shall be barred" is the choice of the Chapter  
10 11 Trustee, that it be appropriately footnoted with an  
11 indication that it may be subject to amendment, and there may  
12 even be an opportunity for later filed claims. See the  
13 Pioneer case.

14 Hold on just a moment. Let me just make sure. Oh,  
15 one last thing that I think Mr. Lipton suggested, or perhaps  
16 it was Mr. Sobol, that this court may want to have a joint  
17 session with the district court. I'm not calling for that.  
18 If the district court finds it of value then I can make my way  
19 to Boston well enough. But so long as the district court is  
20 satisfied that I'm doing the job the way it would prefer, then  
21 I'm happy to do that from a distance. I'm happy to do a joint  
22 session, if that's what the district court wants, and I'm even  
23 happy to -- not happy, but I'm either content to send the file  
24 to the district court, if the district court chooses to  
25 withdraw the reference. At the moment, I don't see any

1 indication that the district court wishes to do that.

2 So now, in terms of timing. I'm going to ask the  
3 Chapter 11 Trustee to send me a proposed order, ordering the  
4 notice intermediaries who administered these adulterated lots  
5 identified by the CDC, to supply the names, addresses, last  
6 four digits of the Social Security number, what was  
7 administered and when, to the trustee on or before August 16.  
8 I then would ask the Chapter 11 Trustee and his counsel and  
9 counsel for the plaintiff steering committee to sit down and  
10 see if they can create a joint list of who it is that ought to  
11 get this actual notice.

12 Then I want the notice to be published ten days  
13 after the bar-date order, and then twenty days before the  
14 expiration of the order, in each of the newspapers which were  
15 listed in the trustee's amended supplemental bar-date motion.  
16 It currently reads that the trustee has the option to do that;  
17 I would prefer that the trustee be directed to do it.

18 And I assume that that list is a list of newspapers  
19 of general distribution in those places where the drug was  
20 administered. If somebody thinks that there ought to be  
21 another newspaper, then I'm happy to hear about that, and I  
22 would be happy to hear about it on August 22 at 10 a.m. in  
23 Springfield. Parties who wish to appear by phone, as they  
24 have today, are welcome to do so again.

25 On August 22, I'm hoping that what I will hear



1 counsel for the PSC and counsel for the Chapter 11 Trustee and  
2 counsel for the creditors' committee. What I will hear from  
3 them is that they have a list, with which they feel some  
4 degree of confidence is a list of all those who received the  
5 drugs from the allegedly adulterated lots. The notice  
6 intermediaries ought to use their best efforts to produce  
7 those names, for no other reason than that, of all the things  
8 that I may eventually release them from, I will never agree to  
9 release them from their original responsibility to have  
10 provided these names to the Chapter 11 Trustee. So they ought  
11 to do a good job, for their own sake.

12 So I'm hoping that I will receive the order from the  
13 Chapter 11 Trustee by week's end. And again, that's the order  
14 to the notice intermediaries to turn over those lists to the  
15 Chapter 11 Trustee and counsel for the PSC, in confidence, on  
16 or before August 16, and we'll address, again, on August 22 at  
17 10 a.m. what modifications need to be made to the notice  
18 that's going to go out to these people and also to the  
19 nonvictims. I hope that you'll have for me a proposed revised  
20 notice consistent with what I've talked about in the last  
21 twenty minutes or so.

22 Thank you very much.

23 MS. BACHTELL: Excuse me, Your Honor?

24 THE COURT: Yes?

25 MS. BACHTELL: Will the Court order that the

1 proposed order include a reference to the face of the proofs  
2 of claim being -- remaining part of the public record?

3 THE COURT: Well, we can --

4 MS. BACHTELL: My apologies --

5 THE COURT: -- we can --

6 MS. BACHTELL: -- Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: -- we can talk about that, but I have to  
8 tell you -- we can talk about that on the 22nd. But --

9 MS. BACHTELL: Okay.

10 THE COURT: -- I have to tell you -- because we're  
11 not sending out yet the bar-date order; we're just -- on  
12 the --

13 MS. BACHTELL: I understand.

14 THE COURT: -- 22nd, we're talking about what that  
15 order's going to say. But I apologize that I didn't reach  
16 that question.

17 But I truly understand the role that the United  
18 States Trustee plays, but I can't help to think of on how many  
19 occasions attorneys, members of the bar, have sent me motions  
20 to impound, and messed it up so that before I could even reach  
21 it, the information was in the public record. In one  
22 instance, the attorney put the problem information in the  
23 motion to impound, and we had to grab it quickly. These  
24 mistakes get made with some regularity, and I'm very concerned  
25 about not -- complicating these people's lives by exposing

1       them in this way.

2                   And I apologize; I meant to mention one other thing,  
3       and that is that when we talk about whoever it is that's going  
4       to be the claims agent, that public disclosure of who these  
5       people are, for my purposes in the bankruptcy court, ought to  
6       be by assigning them code numbers. And those code numbers, as  
7       Ms. Bachtell suggested, might be the substitute that the  
8       United States Trustee could eventually become comfortable  
9       with. I did something very similar to this in the Berkshire  
10      Hospital case, and you may want to talk to counsel for the  
11      debtor, Ropes & Gray, about what I did there.

12                   I'm sorry, Mr. Baldiga?

13                   MR. BALDIGA: Just one quick question, Your Honor.  
14      In your directions, you mentioned the OCC once and left the  
15      OCC out once, in terms of who is supposed to report on August  
16      22nd as to whether we really have this. I just want to have  
17      clarified, given that you're going to be requiring these  
18      parties to make this list available to the trustee, to the  
19      PSC, and I believe you said to the OCC but I just didn't  
20      want --

21                   THE COURT: Yes.

22                   MR. BALDIGA: -- to leave that -- okay, thank you.

23                   THE COURT: Yes.

24                   MR. BALDIGA: That's all.

25                   THE COURT: Also to counsel for the --

1 MR. BALDIGA: Counsel --

2 THE COURT: -- for the creditors' committee, subject  
3 to the confidentiality requirements that we've -- that have  
4 been contained in other orders, I think.

5 MR. BALDIGA: Absolutely.

6 THE COURT: Yeah, okay.

7 MR. BALDIGA: Thank you.

8 MR. STERNKLAR: Just want to be clear, Your Honor;  
9 the order -- Jeffrey Sternklar for the trustee. The order  
10 you're looking for by week's end, you want, is limited only to  
11 what it directs the notice intermediaries --

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 MR. STERNKLAR: -- to do?

14 THE COURT: Well, it will save a lot more time if  
15 you get a copy of the transcript of the last twenty or thirty  
16 minutes.

17 MR. STERNKLAR: I will.

18 THE COURT: Okay?

19 MR. STERNKLAR: But --

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. STERNKLAR: But -- so we're not actually setting  
22 a bar date now?

23 THE COURT: We're not setting a bar date. My  
24 guess -- just a guess -- is that where we're going to go is,  
25 if we have the list at the end of August, that that list goes

1 out sometime in September and that we give parties sixty days.  
2 At the moment that -- I find that attractive, but I certainly  
3 could be talked out about --

4 MR. STERNKLAR: And I'm sorry, Your Honor --

5 THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah.

6 MR. STERNKLAR: -- just a couple questions. You  
7 indicated that you wanted a form -- a revised form of notice  
8 that conforms to what you've talked about.

9 THE COURT: I would appreciate a draft of that, yes.

10 MR. STERNKLAR: When did you want that? You want  
11 that today?

12 THE COURT: No. I want that by August 16th as  
13 well --

14 MR. STERNKLAR: By August 16. I think we --

15 THE COURT: -- so that parties have an opportunity  
16 to look at it and --

17 MR. STERNKLAR: Okay.

18 THE COURT: -- and --

19 MR. STERNKLAR: Okay.

20 THE COURT: -- respond to it.

21 MR. STERNKLAR: Finally, Your Honor, you mentioned  
22 that there's -- you mentioned that the notice should contain  
23 some language to the effect that if creditors file a claim or  
24 not, they may be affecting their rights against third parties.

25 THE COURT: If they fail to file a claim.

1 MR. STERNKLAR: Well, I suppose our contemplation  
2 would be that the third-party releases would, if they're  
3 approved --

4 THE COURT: Right, but there are no third-party  
5 releases.

6 MR. STERNKLAR: Right, if the --

7 THE COURT: Third-party releases are unborn.

8 MR. STERNKLAR: I beg your pardon?

9 THE COURT: Third-party releases are unborn.

10 MR. STERNKLAR: Un?

11 THE COURT: They're not here yet.

12 MR. STERNKLAR: Yeah, oh, right. But at -- there is  
13 at least the open prospect it would be binding on those even  
14 if they do file claims or whether they don't. In other words,  
15 the only thing that the claim does is affects their rights  
16 against NECC. Whether they file a claim or not may have no  
17 bearing on whether they're bound by third-party releases  
18 against third parties.

19 THE COURT: That's why the word "may" is there.

20 MR. STERNKLAR: I'm sorry --

21 THE COURT: That -- I'm sorry. That's why the word  
22 "may" is there.

23 MR. STERNKLAR: Okay. Okay.

24 THE COURT: We just want to warn them --

25 MR. STERNKLAR: Okay.

1 THE COURT: -- as I think you tried to do, except  
2 that you raised the hackles of some of the notice  
3 intermediaries. We just want to warn them that sitting and  
4 doing nothing may not only affect their ability to get a  
5 distribution from NECC but may affect their ability ultimately  
6 to get recoveries from other parties.

7 MR. STERNKLAR: I suppose whether they do nothing or  
8 not may affect their rights against third parties at all; it  
9 only affects their rights against NECC. That's what I'm  
10 struggling with.

11 THE COURT: Well, ultimately it may impact if there  
12 are third-party releases, but I don't know where the case is  
13 going.

14 MR. STERNKLAR: I don't either; that's why I was  
15 thinking perhaps the notice simply needs to say, 'If you file  
16 a' -- 'don't file a claim, you may not have rights against  
17 NECC. You should consider' -- 'When you're considering  
18 whether to file a claim, you should be mindful of the fact  
19 that, regardless whether you file a claim, a plan may one day  
20 cut off your rights against third parties.'

21 THE COURT: Only a lawyer would understand that  
22 sentence --

23 MR. STERNKLAR: Well, I'm not drafting --

24 THE COURT: -- and barely. And I struggled.

25 MR. STERNKLAR: And I probably misspoke. But,

1       okay --

2               THE COURT:   If --

3               MR. STERNKLAR:  -- thank you, Your Honor.

4               THE COURT:   If you want to fashion something a  
5       little bit different --

6               MR. STERNKLAR:  That's fine.

7               THE COURT:   -- it's an opportunity to do that for  
8       August 22nd.

9               MR. STERNKLAR:  Okay.  So this is an interim order,  
10      then, only for the --

11               THE COURT:   It's an interim order.  We're going to  
12      get the names and the addresses of these people.

13               MR. STERNKLAR:  Got it.

14               THE COURT:   And that's all we're going to do, except  
15      we're going to try to get a little closer to an agreement  
16      between all the parties that are managing these two  
17      proceedings, by August 22, and then see where we have  
18      differences.

19               MR. STERNKLAR:  Thank you, Your Honor.

20               THE COURT:   All right?  Thank you.

21               IN UNISON:   Thank you, Your Honor.

22               MR. CHRISTIE:  Your Honor, is there an issue we can  
23      address telephonically?

24               THE COURT:   I'm sorry, counsel.  You mean on August  
25      22nd?



1 MR. CHRISTIE: No, just an issue that you did not, I  
2 don't believe, cover in your rationale.

3 THE COURT: All right --

4 MR. CHRISTIE: This is William Christie.

5 THE COURT: -- you want to tell me quickly what that  
6 is?

7 MR. CHRISTIE: Yes. William Christie; I represent  
8 Pain Care. An issue that we raised and other clinics raised,  
9 while I understand your ruling on HIPAA that a court order  
10 would cover HIPAA, but we also raised in our pleadings that we  
11 are concerned that HIPAA's a 4 (ph.) and, above that, is  
12 doctor-patient privilege issues in providing names of patients  
13 to third parties, including the trustee. It was an issue that  
14 the district court was very concerned about last week in  
15 enforcing the subpoenas. And just our concerns moving  
16 forward, unless I misunderstood, I don't believe your verbal  
17 order addressed that.

18 THE COURT: I'm comfortable that my order satisfies  
19 those concerns, for these very limited purposes. And I'd ask  
20 the Chapter 11 trustee to put language in the order to that  
21 effect.

22 MR. STERNKLAR: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

24 (End of requested audio at 4:42 p.m.)

25 \* \* \* \* \*

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Clara Rubin, the court approved transcriber, do hereby certify the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.



July 29, 2013

DATE

	73:2	<b>administrator (2)</b> 61:10;93:16	25;101:14;104:23,23; 105:3,12;106:22; 107:8;108:1;111:24; 112:13,16	<b>allowed (6)</b> 13:17;31:10;51:5; 56:7;106:2;110:1
[	<b>action' (2)</b> 77:13,15	<b>admissible (1)</b> 57:13	<b>against (45)</b> 10:2,3,25;11:6,24; 14:18,19;20:22;21:6; 22:1,2,3;24:19;26:8; 32:14;37:16;38:16; 39:13;56:4;62:24;65:3; 4,16,18,18;66:8,15,20; 68:19,23;87:19;90:13; 18;91:4,15,17;94:17; 108:6;116:24;117:16; 18;118:8,9,16,20	<b>allowing (3)</b> 20:24;86:25;101:15
[the] (1) 11:9	<b>actions (11)</b> 11:5;15:23;16:10; 20:22;24:10;37:16; 42:6,15;52:24;74:24; 80:16	<b>admission (1)</b> 9:6		<b>allows (1)</b> 83:20
A		<b>adult (1)</b> 101:2		<b>almost (5)</b> 14:11;54:8;70:21; 73:10,11
a' (1) 118:16	<b>actively (1)</b> 84:6	<b>adulterated (5)</b> 108:19;109:9,23; 111:4;112:5		<b>alone (6)</b> 13:9;70:4,4;83:15; 87:12,15
ability (6) 13:19;29:4,5;32:23; 118:4,5	<b>activity (1)</b> 35:14	<b>advantage (3)</b> 39:11;85:24;99:12		<b>along (2)</b> 33:3;64:7
able (10) 27:22;28:11;35:20; 62:13;76:16;79:6; 85:22;86:25;88:15; 92:6	<b>actual (9)</b> 42:22;43:5;51:14; 54:17;87:16;89:17; 90:4;106:21;111:11	<b>adversaries (4)</b> 38:14;39:5,10,12		<b>alteration (1)</b> 45:11
above (2) 12:1;120:11	<b>actually (9)</b> 42:3;63:10;64:8; 69:25;80:13;92:8; 96:23;105:7;115:21	<b>adversary (3)</b> 38:7;52:17;96:4	<b>agencies (1)</b> 48:6	<b>alternative (2)</b> 34:12;84:10
absence (1) 48:16	<b>add (2)</b> 29:10;85:8	<b>advice (1)</b> 109:3	<b>agenda (1)</b> 51:12	<b>although (2)</b> 45:19;68:20
absent (3) 39:25;40:1;56:7	<b>addenda (1)</b> 51:11	<b>advise (1)</b> 91:4	<b>agent (12)</b> 51:23;54:22,23,24; 55:7;97:11,21;99:11; 108:21;109:6,7;114:4	<b>altogether (2)</b> 15:20;16:9
Absolutely (3) 8:10;60:15;115:5	<b>addendum (8)</b> 83:11,15;93:10; 103:25;104:1,2,20; 105:7	<b>advocacy (1)</b> 58:21	<b>agents (2)</b> 108:16;109:4	<b>always (6)</b> 36:7;37:3;38:1; 52:21;109:21,24
abstract (1) 79:7	<b>addendums (1)</b> 104:7	<b>advocating (1)</b> 89:23	<b>aggressively (1)</b> 59:7	<b>ambiguity (1)</b> 50:24
acceptable (1) 86:15	<b>additional (6)</b> 6:13,16;24:8;45:12; 57:10;77:20	<b>affect (5)</b> 29:20;108:6;118:4,5, 8	<b>agnostic (2)</b> 65:10;66:22	<b>amend (1)</b> 52:9
access (2) 48:12;83:5	<b>Additionally (1)</b> 9:23	<b>affected (5)</b> 23:20;54:19;57:1; 88:22;92:6	<b>ago (5)</b> 21:19;38:17;63:20; 75:13;81:4	<b>amended (12)</b> 6:6;31:17,25;34:12; 35:18;41:11;81:5; 87:14;93:18;109:21, 25;111:15
accommodation (3) 31:5;46:4;91:10	<b>address (14)</b> 31:7;48:1;53:13; 69:5;70:22;82:25;83:4; 87:6,7;90:9;100:12; 107:24;112:16;119:23	<b>affecting (1)</b> 116:24	<b>agree (8)</b> 22:22;24:14;34:20, 20;77:24;90:4;106:10; 112:8	<b>amendment (1)</b> 110:11
accommodations (2) 7:10;45:25	<b>addresses (7)</b> 48:24;53:11;75:17; 81:13;107:13;111:5; 119:12	<b>affects (3)</b> 71:14;117:15;118:9	<b>agreeable (1)</b> 51:23	<b>amendments (1)</b> 82:23
accomplishing (1) 36:18	<b>addressed (3)</b> 109:11,13;120:17	<b>affidavit (3)</b> 40:9,25;57:24	<b>agreed (4)</b> 16:16;44:6;87:13; 91:5	<b>among (1)</b> 73:11
according (3) 11:11;87:25;103:8	<b>adds (2)</b> 21:1;31:8	<b>affiliate (1)</b> 16:1	<b>agreement (6)</b> 16:5;73:20,23;83:11; 100:11;119:15	<b>amount (2)</b> 51:25;58:11
Accordingly (2) 24:24;109:1	<b>adequacy (1)</b> 70:16	<b>affiliated (1)</b> 91:1	<b>ahead (9)</b> 9:19;33:17;60:16; 79:23,24;96:18,21; 100:8;101:13	<b>amounts (1)</b> 29:20
account (2) 18:2;99:3	<b>adequate (1)</b> 41:25	<b>affiliates (3)</b> 10:3;42:10;76:14	<b>airport (1)</b> 25:8	<b>analogy (1)</b> 98:13
accumulatively (1) 68:8	<b>adequately (1)</b> 68:20	<b>affirmative (1)</b> 48:16	<b>allegedly (1)</b> 112:5	<b>analyzing (1)</b> 80:2
accurately (3) 20:16;93:19;94:4	<b>administer (1)</b> 45:9	<b>affirmatively (1)</b> 29:12	<b>alleges (1)</b> 58:21	<b>ancillary (1)</b> 14:13
accustomed (1) 85:11	<b>administered (14)</b> 16:15;43:10;44:5; 87:20;88:12,25;90:7; 92:21;107:7,8,15; 111:4,7,20	<b>afford (1)</b> 78:4	<b>alleviated (1)</b> 82:10	<b>announced (2)</b> 8:14;76:19
acquired (1) 28:24	<b>administrative (1)</b> 49:21	<b>afraid (1)</b> 8:8	<b>allocation (1)</b> 69:19	<b>answer's (1)</b> 67:18
acquisition (1) 69:9		<b>afternoon (8)</b> 6:3,22,24;7:2,5;9:15; 22:14;82:19	<b>allow (6)</b> 26:12;31:19;35:19; 50:7;59:22;76:15	<b>anticipate (1)</b> 30:20
acrimony (1) 57:2		<b>Again (34)</b> 9:17;12:25;16:13; 17:14;19:2,12;31:3; 48:23,25;49:14;50:8; 57:3;60:25;66:21; 67:11,22;68:17,22; 70:3;77:12;98:25;99:3,	<b>allowance (1)</b> 13:21	<b>anticipated (1)</b> 19:11
Act (2) 21:7;78:5				<b>anticipating (2)</b> 46:5;69:7
acting (1) 81:9				<b>apologies (1)</b> 113:4
action (9) 10:24;11:4;32:7; 52:15,20,21,23;58:17;				

<p><b>apologize (3)</b> 60:25;113:15;114:2</p> <p><b>app (1)</b> 31:19</p> <p><b>apparent (3)</b> 23:22;27:10,11</p> <p><b>apparently (1)</b> 91:7</p> <p><b>appear (2)</b> 86:25;111:23</p> <p><b>appearance (1)</b> 32:6</p> <p><b>applicable (1)</b> 103:12</p> <p><b>applicant (1)</b> 35:6</p> <p><b>application (10)</b> 6:7;15:22;28:3; 31:25;34:13;35:18; 36:14;38:24;62:17; 96:24</p> <p><b>applications (8)</b> 29:16;34:4;35:1,20, 25;38:19,20;39:6</p> <p><b>applies (3)</b> 96:2;97:5;98:13</p> <p><b>apply (5)</b> 13:24;15:23;16:2; 73:23;96:21</p> <p><b>appoint (1)</b> 107:1</p> <p><b>appointed (1)</b> 27:11</p> <p><b>appreciate (5)</b> 20:2;22:19;74:20; 100:10;116:9</p> <p><b>appreciated (1)</b> 77:11</p> <p><b>appreciates (1)</b> 82:21</p> <p><b>appreciating (1)</b> 74:21</p> <p><b>approach (4)</b> 15:15;33:3;52:22; 56:24</p> <p><b>appropriate (3)</b> 49:6;80:17;97:23</p> <p><b>appropriately (2)</b> 106:13;110:10</p> <p><b>approve (3)</b> 29:13;79:22;106:1</p> <p><b>approved (4)</b> 43:14;63:6;70:4; 117:3</p> <p><b>approves (1)</b> 39:18</p> <p><b>approving (2)</b> 6:13,15</p> <p><b>apps (2)</b> 34:15;35:21</p> <p><b>area (3)</b> 13:11;26:11;84:17</p> <p><b>argue (1)</b></p>	<p>97:5</p> <p><b>argued (3)</b> 77:9,11;103:25</p> <p><b>argues (1)</b> 52:15</p> <p><b>arguing (1)</b> 77:12</p> <p><b>argument (5)</b> 12:16;20:23;49:12; 54:21;77:16</p> <p><b>arguments (2)</b> 55:10;85:19</p> <p><b>arise (1)</b> 7:22</p> <p><b>arisen (2)</b> 43:25;53:15</p> <p><b>arises (1)</b> 13:14</p> <p><b>arising (1)</b> 75:3</p> <p><b>around (10)</b> 7:12;12:18;64:8; 73:22;97:9,10;104:25; 106:12;107:3,4</p> <p><b>Arps (2)</b> 95:19;102:24</p> <p><b>arranged (1)</b> 43:13</p> <p><b>arrangement (1)</b> 29:9</p> <p><b>arrangements (1)</b> 63:23</p> <p><b>arrogance (1)</b> 107:23</p> <p><b>articulated (2)</b> 21:19;27:17</p> <p><b>ascertainable (2)</b> 42:23;44:25</p> <p><b>aspersions (1)</b> 55:3</p> <p><b>assert (2)</b> 13:20;14:5</p> <p><b>asserted (2)</b> 17:19;23:6</p> <p><b>assertion (2)</b> 13:19;47:22</p> <p><b>assess (1)</b> 89:11</p> <p><b>assessed (1)</b> 88:23</p> <p><b>assets (3)</b> 101:18;106:1,2</p> <p><b>assigning (1)</b> 114:6</p> <p><b>assist (3)</b> 33:4;83:22;97:11</p> <p><b>assume (2)</b> 40:15;111:18</p> <p><b>assuming (2)</b> 33:24;82:8</p> <p><b>assure (1)</b> 9:25</p> <p><b>asymptomatic (1)</b></p>	<p>93:7</p> <p><b>attempt (1)</b> 91:25</p> <p><b>attempting (1)</b> 88:4</p> <p><b>attention (1)</b> 41:19</p> <p><b>Attorney (6)</b> 82:25;85:2,13;104:6, 11;113:22</p> <p><b>attorneys (3)</b> 27:16;104:25;113:19</p> <p><b>attorneys' (1)</b> 81:21</p> <p><b>attractive (1)</b> 116:2</p> <p><b>audio (1)</b> 120:24</p> <p><b>August (12)</b> 111:7,22,25;112:16, 16;114:15;115:25; 116:12,14;119:8,17,24</p> <p><b>authorities (1)</b> 93:6</p> <p><b>authority (7)</b> 24:19;47:6;49:11,13; 89:4;97:6;102:2</p> <p><b>authorized (1)</b> 77:19</p> <p><b>authorizes (2)</b> 49:1,6</p> <p><b>authorizing (1)</b> 6:9</p> <p><b>available (13)</b> 29:21;45:1,7,7; 48:25;49:2;51:15;52:3; 58:6;83:18;84:23,24; 114:18</p> <p><b>avers (1)</b> 54:11</p> <p><b>avoid (2)</b> 12:3;75:2</p> <p><b>aware (5)</b> 12:2;50:3;56:3; 90:20;103:2</p> <p><b>away (2)</b> 13:15;37:5</p> <p><b>awful (1)</b> 33:6</p>	<p>71:1,21;75:4;79:20; 81:4;104:13</p> <p><b>backdating (1)</b> 64:5</p> <p><b>background (3)</b> 8:24;32:18;58:2</p> <p><b>back-identifying (1)</b> 70:5</p> <p><b>backwards (2)</b> 57:6;102:11</p> <p><b>bad (2)</b> 58:14;66:20</p> <p><b>balance (5)</b> 37:3;38:6,10,12,15</p> <p><b>balancing (2)</b> 78:4,5</p> <p><b>BALDIGA (39)</b> 7:2,3;8:6,10,11;9:5, 9,11,14;12:23,24,25; 15:17;16:20,24;19:21; 25:2,7;31:1,2,2;60:8, 11,13;72:16,17,19,20; 76:12;82:13,16; 102:14;114:12,13,22, 24;115:1,5,7</p> <p><b>ball (1)</b> 105:20</p> <p><b>balloting (1)</b> 80:4</p> <p><b>bank (1)</b> 63:11</p> <p><b>bankruptcy (34)</b> 10:1;24:6,11;35:8; 37:6;38:2,9,16;48:1; 49:23;57:15;58:4; 65:15;71:12,15;72:18; 74:9;84:13;92:20; 93:11;94:12;96:7; 97:10;100:21;101:6; 102:6,11,19;105:17,25; 109:3,8,15;114:5</p> <p><b>banks (3)</b> 98:8,10,12</p> <p><b>bar (71)</b> 6:12;7:17;41:22,23, 24;42:7,12,21,22; 43:13;44:1;45:9;47:19; 49:10;50:2;53:5,5,6,7, 18,21,24;54:7,8,20,21; 58:21,22,22;59:13,17; 60:6;66:6;67:4,10,14, 21;73:8,22;74:1,20; 76:20,22;77:2,5;81:10, 22;82:7,11,22;85:7,9, 10;90:16;91:16,21,23; 102:1,4,13,15;103:20; 105:5,5,9;106:10,11; 109:15;113:19;115:22, 23</p> <p><b>bar-date (22)</b> 18:4;25:18;41:19; 42:20;47:3;49:19;51:4; 53:16;54:6;55:23;</p>	<p>56:12;59:18;64:14; 65:12;69:3;71:13; 79:13;80:8;94:13; 111:13,15;113:11</p> <p><b>barely (1)</b> 118:24</p> <p><b>barred (6)</b> 90:13,13;110:7,8,9,9</p> <p><b>barring (2)</b> 66:14;84:16</p> <p><b>Barry (1)</b> 40:8</p> <p><b>based (7)</b> 20:8,10;47:19;58:17; 91:6;92:10,20</p> <p><b>basis (6)</b> 12:10;43:18;87:11; 88:15;93:7,8</p> <p><b>Beach (22)</b> 6:8;26:4,10;27:4,4, 24;28:1;36:4,5,6,6,12, 16,16,18,21,25;39:18, 19;40:1,3;74:4</p> <p><b>Beach's (1)</b> 29:23</p> <p><b>bear (2)</b> 23:7;46:7</p> <p><b>bearing (1)</b> 117:17</p> <p><b>became (2)</b> 27:10,11</p> <p><b>become (1)</b> 114:8</p> <p><b>becomes (4)</b> 33:18;34:6;39:4; 59:17</p> <p><b>beg (1)</b> 117:8</p> <p><b>began (1)</b> 69:11</p> <p><b>begin (3)</b> 64:3;98:20;107:23</p> <p><b>Beginning (2)</b> 6:19;102:5</p> <p><b>begins (1)</b> 85:5</p> <p><b>behalf (3)</b> 32:7;72:17;104:6</p> <p><b>behind (1)</b> 104:16</p> <p><b>believes (3)</b> 49:15;87:12,16</p> <p><b>bend (1)</b> 102:11</p> <p><b>beneficial (1)</b> 30:6</p> <p><b>benefit (9)</b> 8:7;14:23;19:12; 23:12;28:12;34:25; 55:17;94:1;102:8</p> <p><b>benefits (2)</b> 13:7;18:19</p> <p><b>Berkshire (1)</b></p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p>114:9  <b>Bertram (1)</b>          6:16  <b>best (7)</b>          18:15;31:23;65:23;          66:2;69:13;70:18;          112:6  <b>better (4)</b>          8:22;83:25;86:9;          106:8  <b>beyond (3)</b>          88:16,17;90:20  <b>bid (1)</b>          69:23  <b>bidding (1)</b>          69:13  <b>big (5)</b>          52:22,23;67:12;          68:11;74:13  <b>Bill (1)</b>          32:5  <b>binding (1)</b>          117:13  <b>bit (5)</b>          8:24;64:18;69:7;          100:13;119:5  <b>black (1)</b>          69:15  <b>blah (5)</b>          65:19,19,19,19  <b>board (2)</b>          73:15,19  <b>board' (1)</b>          76:22  <b>body (6)</b>          13:2;18:11,15;21:21;          22:5;24:16  <b>books (2)</b>          97:16,24  <b>Boston (4)</b>          32:5;101:16,19;          110:19  <b>both (7)</b>          17:8;27:13;36:12;          43:4;59:18;69:10;          104:24  <b>bound (2)</b>          96:19;117:17  <b>box (1)</b>          69:15  <b>brass (1)</b>          78:12  <b>breaching (2)</b>          22:7;28:12  <b>breach-of- (1)</b>          22:1  <b>break (2)</b>          59:25;75:4  <b>brief (5)</b>          59:16;89:2;94:11;          101:23;102:20  <b>briefing (2)</b>          57:10;76:1</p>	<p><b>briefly (2)</b>          23:3;63:4  <b>briefs (2)</b>          11:24;105:11  <b>Brighton (1)</b>          103:5  <b>bring (5)</b>          10:25;11:14;59:7;          68:15;80:5  <b>bringing (2)</b>          22:7;73:15  <b>brings (2)</b>          32:11,23  <b>broad (2)</b>          53:12;98:22  <b>broader (3)</b>          56:19,19;58:6  <b>brokers (3)</b>          98:9,10,12  <b>brought (1)</b>          73:21  <b>Brown (5)</b>          7:3;8:11;72:20;74:3;          81:21  <b>Bryan (1)</b>          6:17  <b>Bryant (4)</b>          7:6;8:23;9:21,21  <b>bulk (1)</b>          59:20  <b>bunch (1)</b>          39:5  <b>burden (8)</b>          7:12;34:19;44:19;          45:1;48:10;97:11;          99:10,13  <b>burdensome (1)</b>          48:10  <b>business (4)</b>          6:11;31:22;35:17;          96:17  <b>businesses (1)</b>          102:4</p>	<p>7:24,25;9:2;12:3;          14:5;19:7,17;28:24;          33:3,4,21;36:1,7;40:16;          24;41:6,24;42:1,18;          43:15;46:9,20;47:1,2;          48:5;51:7;52:6;55:22;          57:7;59:16;61:5,19;          62:11;63:7,9,11,20;          65:23;66:2,4,9;67:14,          18,20;68:21;71:20;          76:9;77:24;79:18;          92:23;96:14,15;97:10;          102:15;103:4;106:13;          107:14;109:21;110:18;          111:10;113:3,5,7,8;          119:22  <b>capable (1)</b>          26:11  <b>capacity (2)</b>          13:5;81:9  <b>Cara (1)</b>          100:4  <b>care (6)</b>          21:7,7;64:16;73:5;          86:21;120:8  <b>career (1)</b>          38:2  <b>careful (2)</b>          36:13,17  <b>carefully (1)</b>          15:1  <b>Case (61)</b>          6:5;11:10;15:7;          18:19;19:11;21:1,22;          23:6,8,23;24:6;27:10;          28:8;30:8;31:10;33:7;          38:12,17,19;39:1,20;          41:21;42:8;43:23;          47:23,24;48:2;52:8,19;          56:25;61:7;64:2;67:20;          68:13;70:5;72:18,24,          25;73:7;75:4,9,19;          77:6,8,16,17;78:1;          80:25;84:4;86:10;          91:15;93:9;95:12,25;          108:5,18;109:3;110:1,          13;114:10;118:12  <b>case' (1)</b>          77:22  <b>cases (33)</b>          12:12,15;13:10;14:7;          15:4,8;16:1,2;19:4;          20:19;23:8,10;26:8;          27:14;30:7;37:6;38:2;          41:20;42:9;45:10;58:3,          4,5;74:5,5;75:3,3;          76:14;81:25,25;84:13;          97:8;110:2  <b>cash (2)</b>          58:6;78:2  <b>cast (1)</b>          55:3  <b>catch (1)</b></p>	<p>8:3  <b>category (1)</b>          90:23  <b>cause (3)</b>          10:24;83:21;89:23  <b>caused (2)</b>          44:12;80:22  <b>caution (1)</b>          30:16  <b>CC (1)</b>          91:7  <b>CDC (13)</b>          78:14;87:25;88:23;          89:3,11,14,15;93:5;          103:8;106:17,20;          107:23;111:5  <b>CDC's (1)</b>          70:11  <b>census (1)</b>          69:17  <b>Center (3)</b>          17:10;24:3;92:22  <b>Centers (2)</b>          44:12;86:22  <b>central (1)</b>          64:12  <b>centralization (1)</b>          76:7  <b>centralize (2)</b>          15:8;74:24  <b>centralized (1)</b>          15:5  <b>certain (10)</b>          6:13;18:14;21:23;          27:8;51:5;59:5;73:17;          76:7;96:20;101:2  <b>certainly (17)</b>          9:12;11:13;14:11;          15:12;17:21;25:23;          26:14;44:14;49:1;          52:19;71:14;74:4;          76:10;85:19;100:21;          103:3;116:2  <b>certifications (1)</b>          52:17  <b>certified (1)</b>          74:10  <b>certify (1)</b>          47:9  <b>cetera (4)</b>          10:4;69:19,19,19  <b>Chambers (1)</b>          59:25  <b>change (8)</b>          15:18;23:4;29:8;          45:13;55:2;79:24;          109:2,4  <b>changed (2)</b>          45:2;98:21  <b>changes (6)</b>          15:18;22:16,21;          27:23;45:14;51:3  <b>channeling (4)</b></p>	<p>65:1;66:8,20;91:18  <b>Chapter (32)</b>          6:7,9,11,25;21:12;          23:2;31:17,22;35:17;          37:14;38:18;39:22,23;          60:5;77:3,4;82:21;          84:22;97:12;107:10,          18;108:13;109:2;          110:2,9;111:3,8;112:1,          10,13,15;120:20  <b>characterize (1)</b>          21:20  <b>characterized (2)</b>          20:16;49:3  <b>characterizes (1)</b>          49:14  <b>cheapest (1)</b>          69:14  <b>check (2)</b>          9:11;73:3  <b>checked (1)</b>          10:18  <b>checks (3)</b>          74:8,13,15  <b>choice (2)</b>          105:23;110:9  <b>choose (1)</b>          47:8  <b>chooses (4)</b>          36:24;105:19;106:6;          110:24  <b>chose (2)</b>          70:1;102:7  <b>Chris (1)</b>          19:23  <b>CHRISTIE (6)</b>          119:22;120:1,4,4,7,7  <b>Circuit's (2)</b>          97:17,18  <b>circumstance (1)</b>          30:6  <b>circumstances (3)</b>          51:6;58:15;68:23  <b>cite (1)</b>          88:10  <b>cited (1)</b>          12:12  <b>civil (3)</b>          24:9;42:6;57:11  <b>claim (61)</b>          6:13;13:6;18:18;          21:2,6;22:1;28:11;          42:12,13;44:15;49:20;          51:11,15,25;52:1,1,2,8;          53:21,22;56:3,5;62:16,          24;63:12,12;65:15;          66:13;68:11,11;75:6;          76:24,25;80:12,14,24;          83:9,17,22;84:9,19,21,          22,24;90:6;93:10;          94:17;95:6;104:19;          108:5;109:25;110:2,6;          113:2;116:23,25;</p>
---	---	---	---	---

117:15;16;118:16,18,19	17:21;27:20;28:6;38:18,22;42:6,15;51:4;62:23;63:18;65:21;68:17;70:13;71:13;76:18;84:11;87:10;94:9;97:17;99:2;104:1,2,8;115:8	<b>color (2)</b> 45:21;77:15	53:1;59:10	63:25
<b>claimant (1)</b> 108:5	<b>clearer (1)</b> 16:19	<b>combination (1)</b> 27:12	<b>compensating (1)</b> 68:8	<b>confidence (2)</b> 112:4,15
<b>claimants (17)</b> 19:16;21:8;39:14;42:3;51:21;53:6,8;57:9;66:18;71:14;84:24;87:12;90:4,13;91:21,22;102:16	<b>clearly (7)</b> 15:13;45:18;46:20;77:12;92:17;99:15;108:20	<b>comfortable (5)</b> 32:13,17;33:22;114:8;120:18	<b>competing (1)</b> 78:6	<b>confident (1)</b> 51:7
<b>claimants' (2)</b> 43:1;83:14	<b>CLERK (5)</b> 6:2,5;49:7;60:3;97:8	<b>coming (4)</b> 63:2;70:4;76:19;103:7	<b>competitive (3)</b> 69:12;79:17;80:7	<b>confidential (6)</b> 28:8;43:18;51:11,13;83:3,16
<b>claims (105)</b> 6:15;13:25;14:19;16:15;17:12,19;18:3,5,5,9,12;21:11,13;22:2,3,17;24:1,4,6,7,11;37:16,17,20;41:23,25;42:1;43:1,4;72:49;21,21;50:2,7;51:5,18,19;52:6,8;53:10,12,14,20,25;54:2,4;56:4;57:1;58:18,22,23,25;61:10;63:1,7;66:1;67:10,17;73:23;74:8;75:2,4;76:7;77:7,19,20;79:25;80:12,15,18;83:5,6;84:16,17;87:9,18,23;88:6,16;90:18,20;91:4;93:16;94:8,9,15;97:9,10;102:13;106:2,3,4,7,14,22,24;107:2;108:22;109:18,18,20,21,25;110:12;114:4;117:14	<b>client (11)</b> 7:19;16:12;17:15;18:17;33:21;96:10;100:14,18,20,22,25	<b>comity (1)</b> 76:12	<b>complain (1)</b> 46:15	<b>confidentiality (3)</b> 42:25;47:4;115:3
<b>Clamp-All (1)</b> 55:21	<b>clients (4)</b> 10:4;81:19;90:17;104:12	<b>comma (1)</b> 16:18	<b>complains (3)</b> 55:12;56:13;59:2	<b>confidentially (1)</b> 59:5
<b>clarification (3)</b> 82:6;96:23;98:25	<b>client's (1)</b> 10:19	<b>commenced (1)</b> 11:6	<b>complaint (2)</b> 57:5;102:25	<b>confirmation (1)</b> 66:18
<b>clarified (1)</b> 114:17	<b>client-trolling (2)</b> 81:13;82:9	<b>comment (4)</b> 16:4;20:14;79:15;89:13	<b>complete (4)</b> 16:6;83:24;104:7,23	<b>confirming (1)</b> 68:15
<b>clarify (5)</b> 17:20;28:10;29:11;63:17;98:25	<b>clinic (14)</b> 10:4;11:1;54:10;62:24,24;65:5,16;66:21;71:4,6;89:9;92:19;103:5,12	<b>comments (6)</b> 31:6;77:10;79:11,11;90:9;102:20	<b>completed (1)</b> 59:5	<b>conflict (3)</b> 24:21;50:24;62:22
<b>clarity (1)</b> 82:22	<b>clinics (24)</b> 13:5;14:19;21:25;43:10;44:4;62:5,10,21;63:25;64:3;70:7,11,13;75:5,9,12;76:23;81:8;90:19;103:2,6,9,18;120:8	<b>commercially (2)</b> 48:22;99:6	<b>completely (3)</b> 30:4;66:4;82:10	<b>conforms (1)</b> 116:8
<b>class (14)</b> 22:4;24:17;52:15,16,20,21,23,24;58:17;73:2;77:13,15;80:16;109:8	<b>client (1)</b> 31:21;68:8;77:11;102:15	<b>committed (1)</b> 81:18	<b>completion (1)</b> 105:7	<b>confusion (2)</b> 87:8;108:24
<b>class-action (1)</b> 78:7	<b>close (4)</b> 31:21;68:8;77:11;102:15	<b>committee (57)</b> 6:17;7:3,19;8:12;12:25;13:1,4,23;14:16;15:7;17:15;18:1,7;20:17;21:17,19,20,23;22:6,20;23:19;24:14,15,22;31:3;39:24,24;60:7;62:17;69:10,11,21;72:8,18,21;73:11,12,14;76:19;79:19;80:2,81:9,20,24;82:10,13;87:15;91:7,14;92:12,13,18;108:1;109:3;111:9;112:2;115:2	<b>complex (1)</b> 27:14	<b>connection (1)</b> 92:3
<b>classes (4)</b> 21:23,24;45:16;108:9	<b>closely (1)</b> 31:17	<b>committees (1)</b> 24:18	<b>complicating (1)</b> 113:25	<b>consensus (1)</b> 79:14
<b>clause (1)</b> 16:17	<b>closer (1)</b> 119:15	<b>common (2)</b> 37:15,23	<b>complies (1)</b> 76:3	<b>consent (1)</b> 16:11
<b>clause (1)</b> 16:17	<b>closure (1)</b> 59:8	<b>commonality (2)</b> 37:19;39:7	<b>comply (4)</b> 21:15;48:17,18,21	<b>consequences (1)</b> 56:8
<b>clean (2)</b> 65:6,7	<b>clue (1)</b> 108:7	<b>common-law (1)</b> 75:7	<b>complying (1)</b> 14:4	<b>conserve (1)</b> 67:6
<b>cleaning (2)</b> 65:7;90:25	<b>Code (11)</b> 8:18;24:12;53:3,11;59:10;74:9;95:2;105:17,18;114:6,6	<b>communications (2)</b> 28:21,23	<b>component (2)</b> 42:16;55:15	<b>consider (5)</b> 33:10;71:18;84:5,19;109:1
<b>clear (24)</b>	<b>cognizable (1)</b> 96:4	<b>companies (2)</b> 90:25;91:1	<b>Compounding (2)</b> 6:6;92:22	<b>consider' (1)</b> 118:17
	<b>colleagues (2)</b> 35:13;41:12	<b>Company (6)</b> 27:6;32:24;62:2;65:5,6,6	<b>compromise (1)</b> 16:13	<b>considerable (2)</b> 31:9;75:15
	<b>collect (1)</b> 108:22	<b>company's (1)</b> 65:19	<b>conceivable (2)</b> 73:15;79:8	<b>considerations (1)</b> 76:13
	<b>collectively (1)</b> 27:8	<b>comparable (1)</b> 98:10	<b>conception (1)</b> 80:24	<b>considered (1)</b> 100:17
	<b>colloquially (1)</b> 29:18	<b>compare (1)</b> 98:8	<b>concern (21)</b> 22:17;24:13;38:8,8,23;39:3;45:4;51:10,20;52:5;53:10;76:6;81:11,12,14;82:10;84:17;85:1;86:12;89:22;93:21	<b>considering (1)</b> 118:17
		<b>compared (2)</b>	<b>concerned (7)</b> 31:16;37:2;51:13;76:12;113:24;120:11,14	<b>consist (1)</b> 14:24
			<b>concomitantly (1)</b> 47:25	<b>consistent (3)</b> 84:3,13;112:20
			<b>condition (1)</b> 104:9	<b>consistently (1)</b> 49:20
			<b>conducting (1)</b>	<b>consisting (1)</b> 18:11
				<b>consolidated (2)</b> 23:9;64:13
				<b>consolidation (1)</b> 42:15
				<b>constituency (2)</b> 24:20;58:7
				<b>constitutional (4)</b> 57:21;59:19;65:13;105:24
				<b>constraint (1)</b>



60:9 <b>constructive (1)</b> 43:5 <b>consumer-friendly (2)</b> 45:3;90:17 <b>contact (8)</b> 43:18;57:14;92:23; 93:9;96:25;97:24;99:7; 106:20 <b>contacted (6)</b> 11:19;71:1;89:16; 93:3,6,7 <b>contain (1)</b> 116:22 <b>contained (5)</b> 52:5;94:13;95:11,13; 115:4 <b>contains (1)</b> 108:11 <b>contaminated (15)</b> 56:16;61:8;71:2; 78:10,13,14,17,24; 79:1;80:22;87:24;88:8; 106:17,20;107:7 <b>contamination (1)</b> 89:5 <b>contemplates (1)</b> 46:20 <b>contemplation (1)</b> 117:1 <b>content (1)</b> 110:23 <b>contents (1)</b> 28:21 <b>contested (2)</b> 10:8,20 <b>context (8)</b> 14:18;64:20;66:11; 72:23;74:17,19;85:9; 98:9 <b>contingent (4)</b> 24:6;47:18;54:3; 109:19 <b>continue (1)</b> 92:6 <b>continues (1)</b> 88:20 <b>contractual (2)</b> 75:7,10 <b>contrary (2)</b> 21:9;55:10 <b>contribution (3)</b> 18:3;42:12;55:17 <b>Control (2)</b> 44:12;46:7 <b>conversations (1)</b> 32:10 <b>cooler (1)</b> 25:15 <b>cooperate (1)</b> 96:10 <b>cooperation (1)</b> 73:19	<b>coordinating (1)</b> 22:20 <b>copies (2)</b> 15:11;16:25 <b>copy (2)</b> 17:1;115:15 <b>core (4)</b> 42:16;52:12;63:5,14 <b>Corporation (1)</b> 95:20 <b>corrected (1)</b> 77:14 <b>corresponded (1)</b> 44:21 <b>cost (14)</b> 17:18;42:19;46:7,8; 47:12;58:10,10;75:15, 15;78:2;79:18;99:10, 13;104:24 <b>costly (1)</b> 56:24 <b>costs (7)</b> 29:20;37:22;38:13; 39:9;46:3;47:15;76:17 <b>counsel (36)</b> 6:8,10,20;8:11; 19:22;20:16;22:13,20; 23:19,23;26:4,6,7,9; 28:5;30:2,7,16;33:19; 35:2;38:20;39:22,23, 24;97:3;105:11;111:8, 9;112:1,1,2,15;114:10, 25;115:1;119:24 <b>countervailing (1)</b> 38:15 <b>country (3)</b> 79:2;97:10;104:25 <b>couple (8)</b> 12:12;14:17;40:16; 71:25;79:23;100:6; 102:21;116:6 <b>course (5)</b> 6:10;28:10,20;37:22; 81:20 <b>COURT (276)</b> 6:3;7:8,13;8:5,7,20, 22;9:2,4,10,13,17,19, 25;10:13,16,21;11:2, 12,13,15,17,21,23; 12:2,22;13:22;14:9,10, 24;15:16;16:11,17,21, 23;17:4,9,16;19:3,14, 20,22,25;20:9,19;21:8; 22:12,25;23:13,17; 24:6;25:2,4,10,13,16, 20,24;26:1,16,19,23, 25;27:2;29:23;30:9,11, 13,22,24;31:12,18; 32:1,14;33:10,12,17, 23,25;34:8,11,16,24; 35:8,15,19,23;36:7,24; 37:7,11,14;39:12,15, 25,25;40:6,10,13,15;	41:2,4,8,10,17;46:21, 21;47:2;49:7,8,10,25; 50:1,6,13,18,21;57:18; 58:24;59:24;60:3,5,10, 12,13,15,18,21,23; 61:13,15,16,20,22,24; 62:4,6;71:6,7,25;72:2, 4,6,13;73:22;76:9,11; 78:22;79:21;80:6;81:5; 82:12,15,17,24;83:7; 21;84:5;85:6,12,15,17, 19,22;86:1,3,5,7,9,13, 16,18,23;88:4,9;89:13; 90:2,2,23;91:6,8; 93:17;94:12,20,23,25; 95:6,10,16;96:9,17,21; 97:1,3,5,8,9;98:5,5,7; 99:18;100:2,8;101:11, 19;102:2,19;105:13,16, 18,20,22;106:4,5,25; 108:12,18;109:1,8; 110:16,17,18,19,22,24, 24;111:1;112:24,25; 113:3,5,7,10,14;114:5, 21,23,25;115:2,6,12, 14,18,20,23;116:5,9, 12,15,18,20,25;117:4, 7,9,11,19,21,24;118:1, 11,21,24;119:2,4,7,11, 14,20,24;120:3,5,9,14, 18,23 <b>court-approved (1)</b> 55:25 <b>courtesy (1)</b> 86:25 <b>courtroom (2)</b> 6:20;17:1 <b>courts (7)</b> 14:9,10;42:10;71:18; 97:9,10,18 <b>Court's (9)</b> 20:2,11;31:6;100:5; 101:9;105:25;107:3; 108:14;110:1 <b>cover (12)</b> 37:22;92:15,16,25; 93:15,18,21,25;94:3, 18;120:2,10 <b>coverage (4)</b> 27:6;30:3,5;37:19 <b>covered (2)</b> 54:17;105:10 <b>crawl (1)</b> 80:25 <b>crazy (1)</b> 71:16 <b>create (8)</b> 13:17,21;63:10;88:6; 92:10;93:21;102:15; 111:10 <b>created (2)</b> 87:9;105:23 <b>creates (2)</b>	36:5;108:24 <b>creating (1)</b> 50:24 <b>creation (1)</b> 91:13 <b>credibility (3)</b> 27:13;33:1;55:3 <b>credible (1)</b> 27:15 <b>credit (1)</b> 73:14 <b>creditor (7)</b> 13:2;18:10,11,15; 24:17;86:10;109:22 <b>creditors (36)</b> 7:4,7;8:12;18:14,20; 21:21,23,24,25;22:4; 23:20;24:9,16,17,20, 23;38:20;42:23;43:5,6; 45:6;47:25;54:5,16; 56:3;58:7;83:5;85:7, 11;108:19;109:9,17,17, 21;110:6;116:23 <b>creditors' (29)</b> 6:17;7:18;20:17; 21:17,18,20;22:6; 23:19;24:14,18;39:23; 49:25;60:7;62:17; 69:11,21;72:18,20; 81:8,24;87:14;91:7,14; 92:13,18;107:25; 109:2;112:2;115:2 <b>critical (9)</b> 67:19,23;69:3;73:4, 6;74:17;77:7;81:23; 91:19 <b>culpable (1)</b> 74:7 <b>currently (2)</b> 96:6;111:16 <b>customers (3)</b> 43:11;56:20;98:11 <b>cut (4)</b> 65:2;74:8;102:15; 118:20 <b>cutting (2)</b> 61:2;102:17	76:20,23;77:2,5;81:10, 22;82:7,11,22;85:3,7,9, 10;91:16,21,23;102:1, 4,15;103:20;105:5,5,9; 106:10,12;109:15; 115:22,23 <b>dates (2)</b> 6:12;53:5 <b>day (5)</b> 12:21;14:8;50:10; 102:17;118:19 <b>days (9)</b> 8:15,18;40:16;49:23, 24;104:19;111:12,13; 116:1 <b>de (1)</b> 77:13 <b>deadline (3)</b> 58:25;59:1;109:11 <b>deal (13)</b> 18:20;30:5;34:22; 52:16;54:6;63:4;65:17; 66:5;69:9;79:9;105:20; 106:8;108:22 <b>dealing (7)</b> 66:6;71:11,12,17,19; 73:6;82:8 <b>deals (4)</b> 49:9;65:25;67:23; 69:17 <b>dealt (2)</b> 84:16;106:18 <b>death (3)</b> 15:4;106:4,7 <b>deaths (6)</b> 10:19;13:10;68:5,12, 13;74:12 <b>debacle (1)</b> 102:3 <b>debt (1)</b> 98:12 <b>debtor (26)</b> 6:18;8:14;23:21,23; 27:8;49:22;54:14;55:4; 65:3;84:20;90:14;91:4; 95:22;96:1,14,22; 97:12,15,19,22,23; 99:9;102:25;103:11, 13;114:11 <b>debtor's (3)</b> 23:24;24:1;27:5 <b>decide (2)</b> 105:5,6 <b>decided (1)</b> 64:9 <b>decides (1)</b> 45:12 <b>deciding (1)</b> 20:11 <b>decision (9)</b> 31:23;57:4,4;65:11, 12;76:8,20;85:14;96:9 <b>decisions (1)</b>
<b>D</b>				
<b>DAILEY (4)</b> 32:4,5,5,16 <b>daily (1)</b> 73:11 <b>date (68)</b> 7:17;41:22,23,24; 42:7,12,21,22;43:13; 44:1;45:9;47:19;49:10, 23,24;50:2;53:6,6,7,18, 22,24;54:7,8,20,21; 58:21;59:13,17;60:7; 66:6;67:4,10,14,21; 73:8,22;74:1,20;75:16;				

July 24, 2013

53:2 <b>declaration (12)</b> 6:17;7:19;10:6,16; 14:11;28:6;29:10,11, 12;30:18;34:14;70:15 <b>declare (1)</b> 11:22 <b>declared (2)</b> 11:10,12 <b>declaring (1)</b> 12:20 <b>decline (1)</b> 47:15 <b>decretal (1)</b> 15:17 <b>de-duplicates (1)</b> 69:16 <b>deemed (1)</b> 47:4 <b>defamatory (1)</b> 95:11 <b>default (1)</b> 40:20 <b>defective (1)</b> 96:3 <b>defendants (8)</b> 21:12;32:7;33:6; 41:13;42:11;65:25; 74:6;91:1 <b>defendants' (1)</b> 82:2 <b>defended (1)</b> 37:20 <b>defending (1)</b> 39:13 <b>defense (12)</b> 27:6,14;28:2;29:19; 30:2,6;33:19;37:16,22; 38:13;39:8,9 <b>defenses (2)</b> 13:20;28:18 <b>defer (2)</b> 56:17;85:15 <b>deference (1)</b> 31:6 <b>deferred (1)</b> 91:24 <b>defined (1)</b> 11:4 <b>defining (1)</b> 11:5 <b>definition (2)</b> 24:11;53:12 <b>degree (1)</b> 112:4 <b>delay (2)</b> 47:24;55:7 <b>delaying (1)</b> 12:17 <b>delays (2)</b> 6:4;109:17 <b>delineated (1)</b> 15:19	<b>delineation (3)</b> 105:14,21,23 <b>demands (1)</b> 78:6 <b>denial (1)</b> 22:6 <b>denied (3)</b> 14:2;22:11;59:22 <b>describe (1)</b> 55:13 <b>described (1)</b> 93:23 <b>describing (1)</b> 56:8 <b>deserves (1)</b> 17:22 <b>deserving (1)</b> 77:21 <b>designed (2)</b> 90:15;102:8 <b>desire (2)</b> 61:5;63:5 <b>desires (1)</b> 92:11 <b>Despite (2)</b> 52:14;90:22 <b>detail (2)</b> 39:20;74:11 <b>detailed (1)</b> 38:10 <b>details (1)</b> 74:14 <b>determination (2)</b> 13:22;36:3 <b>determined (1)</b> 23:10 <b>devastated (1)</b> 13:11 <b>develop (1)</b> 32:18 <b>developed (1)</b> 33:2 <b>died (2)</b> 9:22,22 <b>differ (2)</b> 106:9;107:5 <b>difference (1)</b> 63:15 <b>differences (1)</b> 119:18 <b>different (18)</b> 35:24;45:21;46:21; 54:25;55:11;58:1,9; 73:24;77:15,22;78:25; 91:20;100:13;101:5; 108:16;109:12,22; 119:5 <b>differentiate (2)</b> 101:1;102:3 <b>differently (2)</b> 98:18;108:18 <b>difficult (3)</b> 48:10;51:9;74:6	<b>difficulties (1)</b> 36:5 <b>digits (2)</b> 107:13;111:6 <b>direct (12)</b> 40:24;49:7,8;56:13, 15,22;61:9;78:10,23, 23;97:6,10 <b>directed (3)</b> 92:19;99:5;111:17 <b>directing (2)</b> 43:8;95:23 <b>directions (1)</b> 114:14 <b>directly (2)</b> 15:24;17:6 <b>directs (1)</b> 115:11 <b>disagree (1)</b> 99:4 <b>discharged (1)</b> 84:21 <b>disclose (5)</b> 28:21;37:7,8;47:2,10 <b>disclosed (3)</b> 59:2,8;66:15 <b>disclosing (2)</b> 37:24,24 <b>disclosure (18)</b> 36:18,22;37:4;38:11; 39:3,10,21;41:24,25; 46:20;55:20,25;56:7, 10,11;66:11;67:1; 114:4 <b>disclosures (2)</b> 38:4;39:19 <b>discovery (5)</b> 57:6,7,12,13;63:25 <b>discretion (1)</b> 53:3 <b>discuss (1)</b> 84:1 <b>discussed (4)</b> 11:8;22:18;33:20; 103:24 <b>discussion (4)</b> 15:10;18:22;32:20; 95:9 <b>discussions (3)</b> 18:21;70:18;73:10 <b>Disease (1)</b> 44:12 <b>disfavor (1)</b> 18:13 <b>dismiss (2)</b> 14:7;21:1 <b>disposed (1)</b> 8:1 <b>disrupt (1)</b> 109:10 <b>distance (1)</b> 110:21 <b>distinction (1)</b>	62:1 <b>distracted (1)</b> 29:24 <b>distress (1)</b> 80:15 <b>distribute (1)</b> 105:8 <b>distributed (2)</b> 51:21;104:22 <b>distribution (3)</b> 106:1;111:19;118:5 <b>distributor (1)</b> 12:6 <b>district (16)</b> 97:18;98:7;105:15, 18,22;106:5,25; 107:12;110:17,18,19, 22,24,24;111:1;120:14 <b>disturbing (1)</b> 40:17 <b>diverging (1)</b> 85:12 <b>dividend (1)</b> 24:23 <b>docket (6)</b> 9:11;17:10;18:25; 54:11;76:10;100:12 <b>doctor (1)</b> 65:5 <b>doctor-patient (1)</b> 120:12 <b>doctors (1)</b> 90:19 <b>document (1)</b> 82:24 <b>documentation (1)</b> 6:13 <b>documented (1)</b> 68:5 <b>documents (4)</b> 28:9;83:6;93:1; 103:4 <b>dollar (1)</b> 73:3 <b>Donald (1)</b> 64:4 <b>done (19)</b> 19:8,15,15,18;47:10; 57:20,22;66:2;67:20; 68:21;71:23;78:5;80:1, 1,10;87:5;88:22; 105:13;106:13 <b>Donlin (11)</b> 54:23;55:2,3,4,6; 62:2,11;69:20,20,24; 99:11 <b>do-not (1)</b> 65:13 <b>Donovan (1)</b> 50:4 <b>door (2)</b> 56:9;65:18 <b>double (1)</b>	101:22 <b>doubt (1)</b> 17:23 <b>down (14)</b> 12:4;14:6;25:5,14; 41:18;63:21;64:9,9; 68:24;69:17;78:12; 102:15;109:12;111:9 <b>Dr (1)</b> 54:10 <b>draft (2)</b> 79:13;116:9 <b>drafted (3)</b> 80:13;91:3;93:11 <b>drafting (1)</b> 118:23 <b>drafts (1)</b> 79:12 <b>drawing (1)</b> 62:2 <b>DRC (6)</b> 79:15,17,22;80:5,7,8 <b>drive (4)</b> 31:9;62:8;76:16; 77:2 <b>driver (2)</b> 18:6;77:24 <b>drives (1)</b> 74:2 <b>drop (1)</b> 79:22 <b>drug (4)</b> 78:19,24;80:19; 111:19 <b>drugs (5)</b> 79:1,4;100:16,23; 112:5 <b>dual (2)</b> 29:2;74:19 <b>Duane (1)</b> 6:25 <b>Duck (1)</b> 64:4 <b>due (2)</b> 57:21;80:6 <b>due-process (1)</b> 43:4 <b>duty (15)</b> 18:1,10,11,16,23; 19:1;21:20,21;22:4,8; 24:14,15;28:3;57:17; 99:5 <b>dynamic (1)</b> 81:11
<b>E</b>				
<b>earlier (7)</b> 9:16;18:4;53:12; 73:1;75:24;93:23; 106:11 <b>early (7)</b> 13:14;33:7;42:7;				



75:8;91:16;106:10,11 <b>easier (4)</b> 25:20,22;26:6;50:22 <b>easy (4)</b> 75:19,20,22;85:10 <b>economy (3)</b> 23:18,20;78:6 <b>edition (1)</b> 42:24 <b>effect (3)</b> 70:22;116:23;120:21 <b>effective (2)</b> 64:10,10 <b>effectively (1)</b> 65:2 <b>effects (2)</b> 55:13;104:18 <b>efficiency (2)</b> 13:19;75:1 <b>efficient (2)</b> 11:17;71:21 <b>effort (5)</b> 17:17;64:18,19; 70:14;73:15 <b>efforts (5)</b> 22:19;48:23;82:21; 99:7;112:6 <b>eight (2)</b> 18:22;33:8 <b>eighty (1)</b> 92:1 <b>eighty-odd (1)</b> 56:18 <b>eighty-two (3)</b> 70:6;75:12;76:3 <b>either (13)</b> 34:23;40:2;43:15; 44:16;54:16;63:18; 70:15;85:8;103:21,24; 110:8,23;118:14 <b>election (4)</b> 43:15;46:17;47:13; 49:16 <b>eliminate (1)</b> 15:19 <b>eliminated (2)</b> 15:20;16:9 <b>else (25)</b> 13:23,25;17:15; 22:25;30:24;33:20; 34:1;36:20;39:16; 50:12;52:3;53:7;67:18; 72:7,15,23;74:15; 79:17;95:17;99:19; 100:3;101:12,15; 107:16;108:1 <b>embarrassed (1)</b> 73:7 <b>emerge (1)</b> 54:4 <b>eminently (1)</b> 11:14 <b>employ (1)</b>	6:7 <b>employed (2)</b> 29:7;34:6 <b>employment (6)</b> 25:21,24,25;26:3; 29:9;39:18 <b>enclosed (1)</b> 92:20 <b>encourage (3)</b> 66:22;80:14,23 <b>encourages (1)</b> 80:11 <b>end (11)</b> 24:21;30:22;50:10; 68:24;79:7;92:24; 102:17;112:13;115:10, 25;120:24 <b>endeavor (1)</b> 36:19 <b>ended (2)</b> 12:8;104:13 <b>endorse (3)</b> 26:21,23,24 <b>enforcement (1)</b> 64:12 <b>enforcing (1)</b> 120:15 <b>engage (2)</b> 35:14;58:17 <b>England (2)</b> 6:5;92:22 <b>enough (7)</b> 52:6;68:21,25;92:7; 108:4,7;110:19 <b>ensure (1)</b> 89:10 <b>enter (5)</b> 23:17;24:24;43:8; 63:3;67:10 <b>entered (1)</b> 19:3 <b>enters (1)</b> 63:3 <b>entire (2)</b> 91:11;102:8 <b>entirely (1)</b> 91:12 <b>entities (3)</b> 90:23;107:7;108:10 <b>entitled (1)</b> 59:12 <b>entity (1)</b> 94:16 <b>entries (1)</b> 35:5 <b>entry (1)</b> 45:11 <b>ephedra (3)</b> 74:5;75:3;81:25 <b>equals (1)</b> 14:14 <b>equitable (1)</b> 96:2	<b>equity (1)</b> 98:12 <b>Erlanger (2)</b> 100:5,14 <b>escape (1)</b> 69:25 <b>especially (3)</b> 15:9;20:3;74:7 <b>essence (1)</b> 97:21 <b>essentially (3)</b> 7:15;84:8;105:2 <b>establish (1)</b> 7:16 <b>established (2)</b> 87:18;95:25 <b>establishing (1)</b> 6:12 <b>establishment (2)</b> 41:22;42:7 <b>estate (37)</b> 13:7;14:11,15,20,23; 17:19;19:13,17,18; 23:21;26:8;35:1,7; 36:8,8,17,23;37:16,18, 24;38:16,21,23;39:2,8; 66:24;78:2,6;80:11,23; 84:21;87:19;96:6; 101:18;104:25;106:1; 110:3 <b>estates (1)</b> 38:9 <b>estate's (1)</b> 28:10 <b>et (4)</b> 10:4;69:19,19,19 <b>evaluated (2)</b> 88:11;89:10 <b>evaluating (1)</b> 14:20 <b>even (28)</b> 9:5;13:3,5;14:23; 19:11;21:8,19;24:17; 30:6;49:3;53:22;55:22; 57:10,16,23;58:11; 65:25;75:25;92:7;96:3; 102:10;104:9;107:23; 109:25;110:12,22; 113:20;117:13 <b>event (2)</b> 84:22;109:4 <b>eventually (2)</b> 112:8;114:8 <b>everybody (11)</b> 10:17;54:9,11;66:13, 19;68:9;70:14;106:12, 18;107:3,8 <b>everybody's (1)</b> 66:14 <b>everyone (8)</b> 11:18;15:13;43:16; 54:12;74:14;78:10; 80:23;101:15	<b>evidence (7)</b> 57:13;87:23;89:4; 90:1,2;93:23;100:17 <b>exactly (2)</b> 19:5,8 <b>examination (1)</b> 95:8 <b>except (2)</b> 118:1;119:14 <b>exception (4)</b> 20:4,13;94:14; 108:12 <b>exchange (1)</b> 91:18 <b>exclusive (1)</b> 21:5 <b>exclusively (1)</b> 46:14 <b>exculpation (1)</b> 48:16 <b>excusable (2)</b> 50:8;110:3 <b>excuse (3)</b> 42:5;46:24;112:23 <b>exercise (3)</b> 21:21;35:10;51:19 <b>exercising (1)</b> 76:25 <b>Exhibit (2)</b> 78:20,24 <b>exist (5)</b> 38:12,25;39:3;45:13; 88:6 <b>expect (4)</b> 32:6;39:20;74:6,15 <b>expectation (2)</b> 35:8;55:14 <b>expected (1)</b> 44:10 <b>expecting (1)</b> 51:18 <b>expects (1)</b> 69:1 <b>expedition (1)</b> 92:7 <b>expend (1)</b> 73:14 <b>expenditure (1)</b> 75:5 <b>expense (10)</b> 11:21;12:19;13:18; 14:14,14,22,23;19:17; 21:1;67:2 <b>expense' (1)</b> 19:17 <b>expenses (2)</b> 99:1,9 <b>expensive (1)</b> 109:5 <b>experienced (1)</b> 81:24 <b>expert (4)</b> 57:25;61:10;63:1,7	<b>expertise (1)</b> 27:13 <b>expiration (3)</b> 47:21;48:3;111:14 <b>explain (1)</b> 8:24 <b>explained (4)</b> 35:15;51:16;55:24; 62:20 <b>explains (2)</b> 58:2;92:22 <b>explicit (2)</b> 78:21,25 <b>explicitly (1)</b> 76:15 <b>exposed (4)</b> 80:19,21;88:2,11 <b>exposing (1)</b> 113:25 <b>exposure (1)</b> 93:14 <b>exposures (1)</b> 68:5 <b>expressed (4)</b> 29:1,3;76:6;94:11 <b>extend (7)</b> 47:20;50:14,15,17; 53:24;87:1;109:14 <b>extended (3)</b> 43:25;47:25;54:20 <b>extensively (1)</b> 31:4 <b>extent (9)</b> 29:23;34:6;36:4,16; 42:9;70:13;85:23; 98:17;99:3 <b>extraordinary (1)</b> 83:8 <b>extremely (1)</b> 108:2 <b>eyes (2)</b> 81:21,21
<b>F</b>				
<b>face (8)</b> 49:6;51:17;83:9,17; 84:12;95:5,14;113:1 <b>faced (1)</b> 14:3 <b>facilitate (1)</b> 17:18 <b>facilities (2)</b> 79:2;90:25 <b>facility (1)</b> 92:19 <b>fact (11)</b> 23:22;24:8;29:24; 39:6;56:2;66:22;98:3; 103:7,21;110:6;118:18 <b>facto (1)</b> 77:13 <b>factor (1)</b>				

14:21 <b>fail (3)</b> 17:12;110:6;116:25 <b>failed (2)</b> 88:5,9 <b>failure (2)</b> 108:5;110:2 <b>fair (2)</b> 73:12;85:10 <b>fairness (1)</b> 83:25 <b>falsified (1)</b> 64:5 <b>familiar (2)</b> 61:25;105:17 <b>far (6)</b> 56:6;63:19;68:7; 88:5;95:8;97:22 <b>fashion (5)</b> 8:1;53:14;91:20; 106:25;119:4 <b>favor (2)</b> 18:13;21:23 <b>fear (1)</b> 80:19 <b>federal (8)</b> 14:9;44:24;46:24; 48:6,11;57:11;89:3; 93:5 <b>fee (14)</b> 29:16;31:19;34:3,15; 35:1,19,21,25;36:3,14; 38:19,20,24;39:6 <b>feel (5)</b> 31:23;46:5;87:5,6; 112:3 <b>feelings (1)</b> 85:16 <b>fees (10)</b> 35:7;36:10,24;37:4, 7;38:9,16,23;39:2;40:1 <b>felt (1)</b> 50:20 <b>Fern (14)</b> 26:10;27:12,22;28:6; 29:10;30:18;31:8; 32:11,23;33:6,10,19; 34:3;37:24 <b>few (6)</b> 7:11;10:8;19:11; 37:3;63:4;77:9 <b>fiduciary (4)</b> 18:10,11;24:15;81:9 <b>fifteen-minute (1)</b> 59:24 <b>Fifth (1)</b> 97:17 <b>fifty- (1)</b> 73:2 <b>fighting (2)</b> 57:2;91:11 <b>figure (2)</b> 62:13;80:2	<b>file (36)</b> 10:3;15:1;21:10; 24:9;29:16;30:18; 34:15;38:20;39:19; 40:17,22;41:24;42:1; 44:15;56:3,4;65:15; 73:12;76:24;80:24; 90:6;106:14;108:5; 109:6,25;110:2,6,23; 116:23,25;117:14,16; 118:15,16,18,19 <b>filed (40)</b> 9:6;10:2;13:13; 15:23,23;16:10;17:7, 10;19:4;20:19,25; 21:14,14;27:10,18; 31:19,24;35:21;38:24; 42:12,20;43:21,22,23; 45:19,20;63:12;64:15; 66:13;77:19;83:5,6; 84:24;87:3;95:11,20; 96:4;100:12;109:21; 110:12 <b>filing (10)</b> 6:12;12:21;18:21; 24:5;32:6;35:19;43:17; 44:9;80:11,14 <b>filings (2)</b> 11:21;42:15 <b>final (5)</b> 50:11;59:16;70:9; 71:9;94:24 <b>finally (6)</b> 24:13;48:15;52:11; 58:20;92:13;116:21 <b>find (5)</b> 63:9;64:8,14;69:13; 116:2 <b>finding (4)</b> 8:14;17:16;20:7; 23:12 <b>finds (1)</b> 110:18 <b>fine (6)</b> 12:8;16:22;25:3; 27:1;41:7;119:6 <b>firm (6)</b> 27:4;69:20,20;70:8; 77:16;82:21 <b>first (32)</b> 7:10;8:4,22;10:2; 11:7;20:3,13,14;21:1, 3;23:23;25:25;27:10, 11;33:18;36:11;37:3, 17;49:18,19,24;61:3; 74:2;77:23;78:12;83:1; 84:2,12;86:24;92:25; 93:12;100:10 <b>fishing (1)</b> 92:6 <b>fit (1)</b> 22:3 <b>five (2)</b>	89:18;98:19 <b>fix (2)</b> 43:24,25 <b>flurry (1)</b> 7:20 <b>focus (1)</b> 46:22 <b>focused (2)</b> 15:2;36:15 <b>follow (1)</b> 63:11 <b>followed (1)</b> 18:21 <b>following (4)</b> 46:1;61:6;69:17; 105:21 <b>follow-through (1)</b> 70:10 <b>footnote (3)</b> 20:7;63:17,20 <b>footnoted (1)</b> 110:10 <b>forced (1)</b> 46:2 <b>forces (1)</b> 55:8 <b>foremost (2)</b> 20:3,13 <b>forever (2)</b> 84:21;110:8 <b>form (6)</b> 6:15;45:2;49:11; 98:24;116:7,7 <b>formal (2)</b> 45:19;71:7 <b>former (1)</b> 56:20 <b>forms (3)</b> 87:10;103:9;104:23 <b>forth (11)</b> 37:25;39:4;71:22; 74:13;75:6,10;80:4; 82:2;85:23;91:19; 94:10 <b>forty (1)</b> 75:14 <b>forty-five (1)</b> 68:12 <b>forward (8)</b> 22:24;31:10;35:18; 57:18;59:6,7;102:16; 120:16 <b>four (3)</b> 16:24;107:13;111:6 <b>fourteen-day (1)</b> 40:18 <b>fraction (1)</b> 13:13 <b>frame (1)</b> 59:4 <b>Frankly (13)</b> 16:12;20:8;56:7; 63:23;64:17,21;67:18;	68:22;69:6,24;71:20; 106:7;109:15 <b>free (2)</b> 44:15;109:24 <b>Friday (3)</b> 41:2,3,4 <b>front (4)</b> 20:8;64:20;74:9,14 <b>frontlines (1)</b> 88:21 <b>full (6)</b> 16:5;66:10;73:10; 75:25;85:23;100:11 <b>full-blown (1)</b> 69:2 <b>fully (7)</b> 30:20;31:11;55:24; 73:21;74:20;76:22; 80:9 <b>fun (1)</b> 71:20 <b>function (1)</b> 106:5 <b>functionally (2)</b> 64:25;66:1 <b>functions (1)</b> 106:4 <b>fundamental (1)</b> 52:24 <b>funds (4)</b> 35:6;78:3,7;84:23 <b>further (8)</b> 39:25;43:7;48:20; 76:1;77:20;80:7,13; 83:21 <b>futility (1)</b> 17:13 <b>future (4)</b> 53:9,10;54:4;88:24	13:2;18:12,15,20; 21:21,22;45:7 <b>gentleman (1)</b> 102:24 <b>gets (2)</b> 57:6;69:15 <b>give-and- (1)</b> 76:4 <b>Given (5)</b> 22:21;54:13;70:1; 91:8;114:17 <b>gives (3)</b> 49:10;73:24;97:5 <b>giving (2)</b> 38:6,14 <b>global (2)</b> 42:17;55:15 <b>goal (3)</b> 15:6;36:14;106:12 <b>goals (2)</b> 23:8;35:24 <b>goes (6)</b> 8:17;67:12;81:22; 97:21,21;115:25 <b>gone' (1)</b> 66:21 <b>Good (20)</b> 6:3,22,24;7:2,5,9;15; 22:14;32:10,24;41:8; 58:14;72:13;73:18; 74:1;79:10;82:19;87:5; 103:17;107:17;112:11 <b>goods (2)</b> 49:21,22 <b>governed (1)</b> 52:18 <b>government (1)</b> 44:24 <b>governmental (1)</b> 48:6 <b>grab (1)</b> 113:23 <b>grant (1)</b> 20:19 <b>granted (4)</b> 24:5,18;26:21,24 <b>granting (1)</b> 20:24 <b>grants (1)</b> 21:8 <b>Gray (1)</b> 114:11 <b>great (2)</b> 18:20;78:5 <b>greatly (1)</b> 33:4 <b>GROSSMAN (8)</b> 86:20,21,24;96:13, 19,22;97:2,4 <b>ground (1)</b> 98:18 <b>grounds (8)</b> 11:2;17:11;21:3,13;
<b>G</b>				
<b>GALLIGAN (21)</b> 7:5,6;8:2,21,23;9:7, 8,15,18,18,20;10:14; 13:12;20:5;25:6,7,9,10, 12,14;73:1 <b>Galligan's (5)</b> 7:19;16:12;17:15; 18:17;20:14 <b>gate (1)</b> 65:21 <b>gather (1)</b> 56:19 <b>gathering (1)</b> 54:25 <b>gave (1)</b> 48:8 <b>general (11)</b> 18:12,17;24:15,23; 49:11;50:2;52:2;85:7, 10;95:7;111:19 <b>generally (7)</b>				

22:5;45:12,13;46:12 <b>group (1)</b> 56:19 <b>groups (1)</b> 18:14 <b>guess (5)</b> 20:13;50:20;62:1; 115:24,24	96:14;100:14 <b>hear (11)</b> 11:2;18:4;45:5; 59:15;99:25;100:2; 102:22;111:21,22,25; 112:2 <b>heard (25)</b> 23:1,10;26:16;27:20, 21;30:25;33:13;34:7; 50:13;60:7;66:3,4; 72:16;73:1;74:4,18; 75:8,24;76:18;86:19; 99:17;100:3;102:14, 24;104:4 <b>hearing (13)</b> 6:6,8,11;7:16;23:2, 23;26:3,19;35:13; 40:23;75:25;76:20; 99:20 <b>hearings (3)</b> 7:12;43:23;76:1 <b>hearkens (1)</b> 8:15 <b>hearsay (1)</b> 70:18 <b>held (1)</b> 73:13 <b>help (4)</b> 12:19;33:3;90:16; 113:18 <b>helps (1)</b> 31:9 <b>highest (1)</b> 24:22 <b>himself (1)</b> 60:9 <b>HIPAA (15)</b> 46:13,18,19;47:6; 49:1;96:20,21,24; 99:12;101:5;108:11, 11,14;120:9,10 <b>HIPAA's (1)</b> 120:11 <b>hire (2)</b> 54:23,24 <b>histrionics (1)</b> 61:2 <b>hodgepodge (1)</b> 14:10 <b>Hold (4)</b> 19:16;25:4;98:12; 110:14 <b>holding (1)</b> 71:18 <b>home (1)</b> 24:6 <b>Honor (159)</b> 6:22;7:2,5,9,9;8:6, 10,13,21;9:5,15;12:21, 24;13:2,9;14:25;15:6, 10,15,18;16:22;17:5; 18:24;19:10,21;21:17; 22:14,16;23:3,16;25:6,	7,12,17;26:2,12,22; 27:1,20;29:13,15,16, 22;30:10,12,15,23; 31:2,4,13,15,21;32:4; 33:15;34:2,15,18,19; 35:4;37:2;40:4,5,7,8, 24;41:6,7,9,15,16,18; 42:20;43:8,14,14; 45:11,12,23;46:18; 47:23;49:13,17;51:1; 52:11;53:12;54:20; 55:5,19;57:20;58:20; 59:14,22;60:8,17; 71:23;72:5,11,19,22; 82:14,18,20;83:1,8,19, 23;84:2,11,13,25;85:6; 86:14,20;92:5;94:19, 21;95:1,3,6,18,19,21, 25;96:3,8,13,19,22,23; 97:4,6,14,25;98:8,14, 17;99:8,15,16,21,22, 24;100:4,10;101:8,15, 22;103:1;112:23; 113:6;114:13;115:8; 116:4,21;119:3,19,21, 22;120:22 <b>Honor's (7)</b> 8:2;25:18;34:18; 38:17;50:3;55:21; 91:24 <b>hoops (1)</b> 24:8 <b>hope (4)</b> 7:24;75:15;76:9; 112:19 <b>hopefully (6)</b> 9:2;33:1,4;68:25; 76:2;82:6 <b>hopes (1)</b> 42:2 <b>hoping (2)</b> 111:25;112:12 <b>horse (2)</b> 45:21;77:14 <b>horses (1)</b> 79:24 <b>hospital (3)</b> 88:18;104:14;114:10 <b>hospitals (3)</b> 21:25;75:9;90:19 <b>hours (2)</b> 71:25;79:11 <b>houses (1)</b> 69:18 <b>huge (1)</b> 81:15 <b>hundred (1)</b> 14:17 <b>husband (1)</b> 9:21	<b>idea (1)</b> 89:14 <b>ideal (2)</b> 75:21;78:7 <b>identifiable (1)</b> 103:15 <b>identifiably (1)</b> 103:16 <b>identification (1)</b> 94:14 <b>identified (8)</b> 26:10;27:5;44:11,12; 106:20;107:14,22; 111:5 <b>identify (11)</b> 6:21;32:2;52:6; 53:20;85:23;91:9; 93:24;99:7;100:22; 108:3;109:20 <b>identifying (5)</b> 52:7;57:9;94:6; 107:21;108:8 <b>identities (3)</b> 44:21;45:6;51:21 <b>ii (3)</b> 16:2,5,6 <b>iii (4)</b> 15:20,20;16:9,10 <b>illness (1)</b> 109:24 <b>illnesses (1)</b> 68:4 <b>image (1)</b> 38:25 <b>imagination (1)</b> 106:19 <b>imagine (1)</b> 54:18 <b>immaterial (1)</b> 68:10 <b>immediacy (1)</b> 74:21 <b>immediately (2)</b> 21:14,14 <b>impact (2)</b> 91:25;118:11 <b>implicates (1)</b> 14:11 <b>implication (1)</b> 53:8 <b>implicitly (2)</b> 18:2;89:24 <b>importance (2)</b> 69:8;74:20 <b>important (23)</b> 13:7;15:2;19:15; 23:7;24:10;27:21; 32:18;33:4;36:1;38:8; 50:11;65:11;71:6; 72:23,25;75:2;76:13; 77:6;85:8;89:2;97:14; 98:9;102:11 <b>importantly (1)</b>	83:23 <b>impose (2)</b> 96:4;103:20 <b>imposed (1)</b> 97:13 <b>imposes (2)</b> 7:13;53:3 <b>imposing (3)</b> 34:19;48:13;95:23 <b>impossible (1)</b> 74:19 <b>impound (2)</b> 113:20,23 <b>improper (1)</b> 98:16 <b>inadequacy (1)</b> 70:16 <b>inadequate (1)</b> 56:14 <b>inapplicable (1)</b> 12:16 <b>inappropriate (5)</b> 36:6;56:11;58:16; 99:9;108:10 <b>Inc (1)</b> 6:6 <b>incentive (2)</b> 15:3;16:15 <b>inception (2)</b> 10:1;91:13 <b>incident (1)</b> 33:9 <b>inclination (1)</b> 36:21 <b>inclined (1)</b> 84:5 <b>include (5)</b> 83:13;92:15,17;94:5; 113:1 <b>included (3)</b> 55:24;92:17;93:18 <b>includes (2)</b> 69:14;88:24 <b>including (9)</b> 17:15;46:8;66:9; 74:5,24;75:23;90:19; 94:14;120:13 <b>inconceivable (1)</b> 54:12 <b>inconsistent (1)</b> 14:12 <b>increase (1)</b> 13:19 <b>incredibly (1)</b> 75:1 <b>incur (2)</b> 19:17,17 <b>incurred (4)</b> 14:22;18:6;47:15; 109:23 <b>indeed (6)</b> 24:18;30:5;55:20; 57:9,17;90:1
<b>H</b>		<b>I</b>		

July 24, 2013

<b>indefinite (1)</b> 53:24	66:20;91:18;95:24; 96:2	28:11;35:10;37:15, 23;39:8;101:9;104:24	63:22;64:23,24;68:18; 70:2;71:13;82:4;84:1, 15;93:20;94:12;95:2; 98:2,3;102:22;105:5; 119:22;120:1,8,13	<b>jurisdictions (1)</b> 26:9
<b>indemnification (3)</b> 42:12;75:2;76:23	<b>injunctions (2)</b> 65:1;66:8	<b>interested (1)</b> 11:20	<b>issued (3)</b> 46:25;70:6;75:12	<b>justify (2)</b> 48:13;76:25
<b>indemnify (1)</b> 37:18	<b>injured (5)</b> 54:2;61:4;71:4; 102:18;103:8	<b>interesting (1)</b> 58:1	<b>issues (34)</b> 7:22,24,25;11:8; 12:3;18:13;30:3,5; 31:20;37:5,19;45:18, 22,24;49:17;54:25; 61:3,25;62:7;64:2; 69:8;71:5,11,12,17,19; 87:7;89:25;98:18,20; 99:1,12;109:12;120:12	<b>K</b>
<b>indemnities (2)</b> 75:7,10	<b>injures (1)</b> 54:1	<b>Interestingly (1)</b> 90:22	<b>J</b>	<b>keep (8)</b> 8:8;36:13;47:23,24; 68:3;97:1,1,3
<b>indemnity (10)</b> 13:6;14:19;18:3,5,5, 9;22:1;29:21;75:6; 76:17	<b>injuries (3)</b> 10:19;14:3;85:23	<b>interests (1)</b> 37:19	<b>Jeffrey (2)</b> 6:24;115:9	<b>keeping (2)</b> 33:10;64:6
<b>indicate (2)</b> 70:7,9	<b>injury (3)</b> 44:10;106:3,7	<b>interferes (1)</b> 57:5	<b>JJ (1)</b> 50:3	<b>kept (3)</b> 48:2;71:24;83:15
<b>indicated (3)</b> 106:6;109:10;116:7	<b>input (1)</b> 33:25	<b>interim (2)</b> 119:9,11	<b>job (11)</b> 63:24;78:5;80:23; 87:5;105:15,15,25; 107:3;108:22;110:20; 112:11	<b>kind (5)</b> 39:9;55:23;58:17; 62:19;96:5
<b>indication (2)</b> 110:11;111:1	<b>inquiries (1)</b> 94:2	<b>intermediaries (30)</b> 43:9,15;44:6,16,19, 20,23;45:15;46:1;47:7, 8,19;48:5;49:4;56:15, 20;59:20;92:14;95:22; 98:6,15;99:11;102:23; 107:6,20;111:4;112:6, 14;115:11;118:3	<b>joined (4)</b> 13:6;14:13;24:3; 73:16	<b>kinds (3)</b> 38:4;46:21;61:25
<b>indifferent (1)</b> 57:6	<b>insert (1)</b> 84:19	<b>intermediary (2)</b> 99:6;107:1	<b>join (1)</b> 79:16	<b>Kinsella (11)</b> 57:24,25;58:2,11,13, 18;62:2,11;69:22;70:8; 80:13
<b>individual (4)</b> 24:19;32:7;33:6; 41:13	<b>insiders (8)</b> 27:9,25;28:4,13,22; 30:16;59:3;66:9	<b>interplay (1)</b> 50:5	<b>joining (1)</b> 22:7	<b>knowing (2)</b> 68:1;74:8
<b>individuals (2)</b> 27:8;28:20	<b>Insight (1)</b> 95:19	<b>interpreted (1)</b> 50:4	<b>joint (6)</b> 69:22;71:18;94:7; 110:16,21;111:10	<b>knowledge (1)</b> 89:15
<b>indulgence (4)</b> 8:2,3;20:3;25:18	<b>insolvency (5)</b> 6:18;7:20;8:4;10:6; 23:21	<b>interrupt (1)</b> 61:15	<b>jointly (1)</b> 27:24	<b>known (4)</b> 42:22;43:5;55:6; 103:15
<b>industry (1)</b> 54:14	<b>insolvent (11)</b> 8:15;10:9,18;11:10, 11,12;12:20;20:6,8,11; 68:4	<b>into (9)</b> 10:7;23:9;33:7; 61:12;62:8;72:24;73:7; 76:13;85:9	<b>Joseph (1)</b> 22:14	<b>knows (4)</b> 15:6;41:23;54:12; 104:9
<b>infections (1)</b> 89:25	<b>Inspira (15)</b> 18:24;19:7;22:13,15; 86:21,21;87:2;89:9; 91:10;92:15;93:3,16, 24;94:2,6	<b>introduce (1)</b> 8:23	<b>Jr (3)</b> 6:17;7:6;9:21	<b>L</b>
<b>inform (1)</b> 88:9	<b>Inspira's (2)</b> 88:18,20	<b>inure (3)</b> 28:12;32:8;55:16	<b>judge (19)</b> 10:11,12;38:4;42:5; 57:9;63:3;64:11,20; 71:11;75:24;76:6,17, 25;77:14,21;81:12; 90:2;98:1;107:12	<b>lack (1)</b> 79:14
<b>informal (1)</b> 31:6	<b>instance (4)</b> 36:11;37:17;95:4; 113:22	<b>investigation (2)</b> 28:9,17	<b>judgment (4)</b> 31:22;35:17;55:9; 58:15	<b>lacks (1)</b> 49:13
<b>informally (1)</b> 49:18	<b>instead (4)</b> 12:15;16:18;44:7; 47:16	<b>invite (1)</b> 94:1	<b>judicial (3)</b> 23:18;83:7,24	<b>language (15)</b> 16:16;17:6;24:25; 51:6;65:21;84:16,18; 85:2,3,4;90:18;91:3; 94:14;116:23;120:20
<b>information (66)</b> 28:7,15,16,23,24; 29:5,5;32:18,22;33:7; 35:15;38:7,14;43:1,18; 45:3,8;46:9,14,16; 47:7;48:12;49:2;51:17; 52:6,7,9;57:12,14; 59:11;62:16;63:12; 67:16;69:18,18;70:8; 71:8;81:10,23;82:1,7; 83:3,13,15,21;84:7,9; 85:9;90:10;92:1,2,23; 94:6;95:5,13;96:11,25; 97:24;98:4;99:7;104:7, 17;106:23;108:12; 113:21,22	<b>insufficient (2)</b> 23:25;63:13	<b>invited (1)</b> 69:20	<b>judicially (2)</b> 11:10,12	<b>large (1)</b> 79:7
<b>inherently (1)</b> 58:14	<b>insurance (7)</b> 23:25;27:6,6;28:2; 30:2,3;68:6	<b>invites (1)</b> 80:17	<b>June (2)</b> 73:20;87:22	<b>largely (1)</b> 47:18
<b>initially (1)</b> 31:15	<b>insurer (11)</b> 27:5;29:18,25;30:7; 35:1;36:4,5,9,12,25; 40:2	<b>involved (6)</b> 11:14;30:3;58:5; 77:17;84:4;96:6	<b>jurisdiction (3)</b> 16:1;77:1;98:5	<b>larger (4)</b> 54:15;56:9;97:8; 109:8
<b>initials (1)</b> 51:24	<b>insurers (2)</b> 27:7;74:7	<b>involving (1)</b> 68:24	<b>jurisdictional (1)</b> 98:3	<b>largest (1)</b> 45:18
<b>injection (5)</b> 78:17;80:20;89:19; 92:3;93:2	<b>intended (4)</b> 26:14;52:13;65:13, 20	<b>Iowa (1)</b> 32:25		<b>last (18)</b> 8:16;10:18;29:15; 45:20;48:3,15;76:3; 77:11,12;84:25;89:18; 94:7;107:13;110:15; 111:5;112:20;115:15; 120:14
<b>injunction (4)</b>	<b>intent (1)</b> 70:10	<b>ire (1)</b> 69:7		<b>lastly (1)</b> 21:17
	<b>intention (1)</b> 24:25	<b>irrelevant (2)</b> 11:7;24:8		
	<b>interest (7)</b>	<b>issue (42)</b> 11:13;12:17;24:2; 33:18;34:3,5,6;38:1; 39:3;42:8;48:1,4; 50:11;51:2,9,16;53:11, 17,17;54:6;61:3,21;		



late-filed (1) 84:17	30:5	lists (2) 75:21;112:14	18:79;25,25;80:1; 87:19,21,23;88:2,3,25; 89:6,7,8,17,20;92:4; 102:14;103:16,16; 115:14	46:12
latency (1) 88:7	liability (14) 10:25;13:18,20,21, 23;14:6;17:12;20:20, 22;21:7,10;48:19,22; 99:2	literally (1) 80:18	lots (22) 11:21;44:11;54:12; 56:17;67:2;88:11,13, 19;90:8;92:6,9;93:3, 20;98:23;100:18,19, 23;106:21;109:9,23; 111:4;112:5	Marc (1) 72:11
later (15) 12:3,4;18:4;66:10, 25;67:1,2,13,22;68:14, 16;69:2,18;103:21; 110:12	lie (2) 13:20;14:3	literature (2) 88:7;104:8	loyalties (2) 29:3,24	March (3) 71:3;73:12;93:8
law (14) 10:15;20:21;21:2,5, 22;26:9;47:22;52:19; 53:3;71:24;96:1;97:16; 103:12,18	lieu (1) 91:11	literature's (1) 104:16	loyalty (3) 19:1;28:3;55:5	Margaret (1) 9:21
laws (1) 71:15	life (1) 65:4	litigation (5) 14:18;39:5;46:25; 57:3,13	M	Mark (1) 99:24
lawsuit (1) 10:2	light (4) 31:24;43:21,22; 55:20	little (7) 8:24;64:18,21;69:7; 100:13;119:5,15	mail (5) 78:11,23,23;79:5,22	Marked (2) 24:25;25:3
lawyer (3) 10:14;32:5;118:21	lightning (1) 91:15	live (1) 62:14	mailing (2) 48:23;81:15	markedly (1) 69:23
lawyerly (1) 96:17	likely (5) 14:18;44:20;56:25; 93:5;108:9	lives (1) 113:25	main (1) 22:17	married (1) 10:13
lawyers (8) 11:19;12:2;63:18; 70:19;81:15,19,24; 101:17	likes (1) 97:5	local (15) 6:10;26:5,7,9,9; 39:21;44:3;49:20,24; 50:9;85:4,13;89:4; 93:6;109:11	maintain (1) 20:21	marshal (1) 105:25
lead (3) 12:3,4;57:12	limit (3) 44:18;56:14;57:11	localities (1) 44:3	maintained (1) 11:6	Maryland (1) 47:19
least (19) 13:10,22;14:5;15:14; 17:7;20:10;23:11; 37:21;47:20;48:13; 71:15;84:25;90:11; 91:21;102:1;103:9,17; 104:5;117:13	limitation (2) 44:18;47:21	located (1) 44:4	major (1) 100:12	mass (1) 27:14
leave (5) 25:8;50:9;102:20; 107:11;114:22	limitations (7) 13:14,16;14:4;48:2, 3;109:14,16	lock (1) 80:8	majority (4) 103:6,14,15;108:20	Massachusetts (1) 98:7
left (3) 42:8,13;114:14	limited (16) 19:3;22:18,23;31:19; 44:9,17;45:3,8;57:18; 90:5;93:20;98:23; 108:2,2;115:10;120:19	lockbox (1) 69:15	makes (6) 23:17;33:22;36:12; 55:9;57:23;96:2	material (2) 63:5;71:14
legacy (1) 8:19	limited-universe (1) 77:8	logic (2) 67:7,12	making (4) 38:4,9;41:25;62:23	materials (1) 63:19
legal (1) 76:4	limits (2) 29:20;92:5	long (13) 22:23;37:21;38:12; 39:9;42:7;47:3;53:24; 64:16;76:5;106:5; 109:21;110:2,19	malpractice (2) 90:20;94:15	matter (12) 10:1;17:3;20:21; 21:2;33:8;36:11;53:19; 65:4;85:16;95:4,11,21
legitimate (3) 75:22;80:19;81:11	linked (1) 89:6	long-arm (1) 12:10	managing (1) 119:16	matters (6) 7:15;28:2;29:6; 42:14;43:2;57:25
lengthy (2) 56:23;104:7	Lipton (11) 72:9,11,11;99:22,24, 24;101:12,13,14,21; 110:15	longer (4) 23:12;27:25;76:21, 24	mandatory (2) 95:24;96:1	maximize (3) 15:3;16:14;66:23
less (8) 57:2,2,2;58:10; 62:21;69:23;78:18; 109:5	liquidate (2) 106:3,6	long-term (1) 104:18	manifested (3) 53:16,25;54:1	may (86) 11:8;13:20;14:3,5, 16;15:15;18:12;19:14; 24:6,7,8,10;25:6,7; 28:12;29:23;30:12; 37:17;42:1;49:8;51:5; 53:15;56:5,8;59:15; 63:18;64:25;65:16,17; 68:23;74:23;76:9; 78:17,24;79:1,1;80:10, 15,17,18,18,19,21,21; 81:4,15;87:8,8,20,25; 88:12,24;89:1;90:5,6, 8;92:9,15;93:2,13; 94:16,24;96:11; 100:17;101:4,4; 105:19;108:6;109:25; 110:6,8,11,11,16; 112:8;114:10;116:24; 117:16,19,22;118:4,5, 8,11,16,19
letter (9) 62:12;92:15,17,25; 93:15,18,25;94:3,18	liquidation (1) 106:24	look (4) 58:4;78:20;96:19; 116:16	manifold (1) 9:23	MDL (34) 15:5,8,24;16:3,7,8,
letters (2) 70:21,23	Lisa (1) 40:8	looked (1) 63:22	manufacturer (3) 11:7,9;12:6	
level (6) 47:14;64:16;68:10; 74:10;80:23;107:23	list (22) 44:25;51:24;52:3,5; 58:4;64:8;81:15;84:1, 5,7;101:3;107:12,19; 109:12;111:10,18,18; 112:3,4;114:18; 115:25,25	looking (9) 10:2;38:21,22;39:1; 78:16;96:12,24; 102:13;115:10	many (18) 7:22;15:4,8,12;23:8; 30:7;38:2;44:22;46:5; 53:25;66:8;75:23; 78:13;79:3;87:7;103:2, 3;113:18	
leverage (1) 91:16	listed (1) 111:15	lose (1) 102:10	map (1)	
Levin (1)	listen (1) 32:25	loss (1) 109:23		
	listening (1) 87:4	lost (1) 68:23		
		lot (27) 12:19;14:24;28:13; 32:22;33:6;58:6;73:18,		

15,18;19:4;22:18,23; 23:6,9,11,11;32:7; 42:14,16;54:25;55:1; 56:18;57:6,7,19;74:19; 22:75:1,14;76:14;88:5; 90:2;91:13;92:1,7 <b>mean (5)</b> 50:20;67:24;78:12; 102:22;119:24 <b>means (2)</b> 10:12;103:12 <b>meant (3)</b> 97:7,7;114:2 <b>mechanism (1)</b> 106:1 <b>mediation (1)</b> 107:1 <b>medical (7)</b> 51:17;54:25;69:18; 83:14;86:22;88:6; 104:8 <b>medication (1)</b> 100:15 <b>medications (3)</b> 100:25;101:2;103:10 <b>meet (2)</b> 23:25;43:3 <b>meeting (1)</b> 49:25 <b>meetings (1)</b> 79:11 <b>megacases (1)</b> 58:5 <b>Meisler (2)</b> 95:18,18 <b>member (1)</b> 9:24 <b>members (6)</b> 13:4;24:20;81:8,23; 82:6;113:19 <b>memorandum (1)</b> 42:4 <b>meningitis (2)</b> 13:10;89:25 <b>mention (5)</b> 11:25;80:9;90:25; 103:23;114:2 <b>mentioned (9)</b> 10:10;18:3;19:1; 23:19;30:18;102:24; 114:14;116:21,22 <b>Merck (1)</b> 78:3 <b>merits (6)</b> 13:24;17:12,17,24; 28:7,18 <b>mess (2)</b> 14:14,14 <b>messed (1)</b> 113:20 <b>Michigan (5)</b> 103:4,6,7,14,14 <b>Mickey (1)</b>	64:4 <b>mid-May (1)</b> 69:12 <b>might (15)</b> 42:7;51:18;52:6; 62:23;63:10;66:1; 71:18,19,20;73:2; 90:11;106:19;108:8; 109:14;114:7 <b>Mike (2)</b> 7:5;9:18 <b>Mikels (13)</b> 30:4;33:15,15,18,24; 34:2,9;37:1,2,9,13,15; 39:13 <b>million (2)</b> 79:4,4 <b>millions (1)</b> 80:17 <b>mind (1)</b> 100:6 <b>mindful (3)</b> 29:1,3;118:18 <b>minimize (3)</b> 13:18;17:18;18:9 <b>minimum (1)</b> 104:20 <b>ministerial (2)</b> 41:20,21 <b>minor (1)</b> 82:5 <b>Mintz (1)</b> 30:5 <b>Minutes (4)</b> 74:11;100:6;112:21; 115:16 <b>mirror (1)</b> 38:25 <b>miscommunication (1)</b> 60:22 <b>mislabeling (2)</b> 90:19;94:15 <b>misplaced (1)</b> 46:19 <b>miss (1)</b> 25:10 <b>misspoke (1)</b> 118:25 <b>mistakes (1)</b> 113:24 <b>misunderstanding (1)</b> 52:25 <b>misunderstood (1)</b> 120:16 <b>mixed (1)</b> 70:20 <b>modest (1)</b> 51:3 <b>modifications (1)</b> 112:17 <b>moment (10)</b> 21:19;25:4;30:12; 41:6;45:22;61:16;81:4;	110:14,25;116:2 <b>moments (2)</b> 10:8;63:4 <b>Monday (1)</b> 41:7 <b>Monday's (1)</b> 41:8 <b>monetary (1)</b> 55:17 <b>money (6)</b> 42:18;54:3;55:8; 58:11,16;105:8 <b>monies (1)</b> 24:11 <b>moniker (1)</b> 51:25 <b>monitor (1)</b> 47:14 <b>month (2)</b> 73:10;75:13 <b>monthly (1)</b> 93:8 <b>months (8)</b> 33:8;63:20;72:24; 73:7;79:24,24;104:10, 21 <b>Moore (1)</b> 6:25 <b>moot (1)</b> 17:11 <b>more (39)</b> 10:15;11:13;14:17; 18:12;30:6;33:22;36:1; 45:3;50:11;52:7;53:25; 56:9,25;57:22,23;58:6, 10;59:9,12;68:4;71:20, 21;75:13;78:2;79:11; 83:2,24;85:10;87:23; 89:1,90:10;92:1,10,23; 93:11,19;103:7;108:8; 115:14 <b>Moreover (2)</b> 54:8;100:22 <b>Morris (1)</b> 6:25 <b>most (14)</b> 11:17,22;17:3;41:20; 44:20;45:14;46:21; 51:9;64:10;75:8,9; 83:23;100:7;108:21 <b>motion (68)</b> 6:8,11,16;7:16,18; 8:4,13;9:6;10:10;13:6, 17,21;14:2,7;15:9; 17:11,21;18:5,19,21; 19:10;20:15,19,24; 21:8,10,13;22:6,7,11; 23:1;24:4,5;25:19,25; 26:3,4,5,12,17;27:3,9; 30:25;32:15;33:14; 40:18,22;41:19,20; 42:20;43:7;45:11; 59:22;60:6;64:15;	72:22;73:13,21;74:23; 80:6;87:14,14,15;96:3; 98:15;109:6;111:15; 113:23 <b>motions (10)</b> 7:17,23;14:24;20:12, 25;25:21,24;26:3;42:5; 113:19 <b>motive (1)</b> 21:13 <b>Mouse (1)</b> 64:4 <b>movant (1)</b> 22:7 <b>move (7)</b> 7:11;9:13;57:18; 64:23;91:14;102:8,16 <b>moving (4)</b> 35:17;59:6,6;120:15 <b>MPA (21)</b> 9:23;13:12;71:5; 78:15;79:3;87:20; 88:12,20,25;89:7,18, 20;90:8;92:9;93:3,14, 20,21;100:16,18; 103:16 <b>much (29)</b> 10:15;15:9;16:12; 18:8;23:25;26:7;38:6; 45:1;53:20;55:22;56:9, 19;58:6;60:17;61:5; 72:5;76:4;77:22,25; 78:1,4,18;94:20; 105:24;106:11,22,23; 108:17;112:22 <b>multiple (3)</b> 11:21;27:20;64:1 <b>multiplicity (2)</b> 14:21;75:2 <b>MURPHY (12)</b> 40:5,6,7,7,11,14,24; 41:3,5,7,12,16 <b>must (5)</b> 11:12;60:20;109:7, 18,20 <b>Mutual (5)</b> 27:6;32:9,24,24; 33:16	107:13,15,21;111:5; 112:7,10;119:12; 120:12 <b>naming (1)</b> 94:15 <b>narrowed (1)</b> 77:10 <b>narrowly (1)</b> 83:2 <b>Nashville (1)</b> 19:24 <b>national (1)</b> 42:24 <b>nationally (2)</b> 54:14;55:6 <b>nature (2)</b> 50:7;52:1 <b>near (1)</b> 67:18 <b>nearly (1)</b> 13:15 <b>NECC (55)</b> 9:23;10:2,17;11:14; 12:20;16:1,2;20:6,7, 11;22:1,2,3;33:10; 42:10;43:10,16;44:8; 54:8;56:4,20;58:7; 61:8;64:2;65:3;68:4; 74:24,25;75:10;76:8, 14;87:17,20,21;88:8, 14,22;91:2;93:22; 100:24,25;101:4; 102:3,6;103:10,19; 106:18,20;107:8; 108:5,6;117:16;118:5, 9,17 <b>NECC's (4)</b> 10:8;12:8;67:4; 93:11 <b>necessarily (1)</b> 101:1 <b>necessary (4)</b> 59:17;61:7;77:5; 94:8 <b>necessity (1)</b> 12:1 <b>NEC's (1)</b> 93:14 <b>need (31)</b> 14:8;19:18;21:14; 26:9;28:9;45:8;47:7; 48:19;52:7,16;53:21; 59:17;63:6,8;66:10,19; 67:16,23;71:21;76:2, 20;77:3;82:2;87:6; 92:10;96:23;97:15; 102:14;103:1;106:21; 112:17 <b>needn't (1)</b> 41:10 <b>needs (10)</b> 8:3;41:23,24;42:1; 55:24;58:25;61:24;
--	---	--	---	---

65:20;106:9;118:15 <b>neglect (2)</b> 50:8;110:3 <b>negotiate (1)</b> 84:6 <b>negotiations (3)</b> 59:3,6;67:17 <b>neither (3)</b> 17:9;42:10;106:3 <b>Network (1)</b> 18:25 <b>Neurological (2)</b> 11:1;24:3 <b>nevertheless (4)</b> 32:22;49:5;51:5; 57:22 <b>New (5)</b> 6:5;66:15;90:17; 91:2;92:22 <b>news (1)</b> 74:11 <b>newspaper (1)</b> 111:21 <b>newspapers (2)</b> 111:14,18 <b>next (10)</b> 25:19;27:3;40:16; 41:3,4;60:13;73:3; 84:15;104:10,19 <b>nice (2)</b> 12:5;79:6 <b>nickel (1)</b> 63:11 <b>nine (3)</b> 87:21;88:3;89:7 <b>ninety (2)</b> 104:19,21 <b>ninety-nine (1)</b> 89:16 <b>non- (1)</b> 80:14 <b>nonbankruptcy (1)</b> 47:21 <b>nondebtor (5)</b> 65:1;66:7,23;67:13; 68:18 <b>nondebtors (1)</b> 66:15 <b>None (6)</b> 10:9;68:1;78:12; 81:16;88:6;104:5 <b>nonmeaningful (1)</b> 20:18 <b>nonparty (2)</b> 100:5,14 <b>nonvictim (1)</b> 67:10 <b>nonvictims (3)</b> 67:15;108:25;112:19 <b>nor (5)</b> 42:10;47:23;58:9; 100:16;106:3 <b>normal (2)</b>	75:11;102:11 <b>notably (1)</b> 54:25 <b>note (3)</b> 58:2;97:14;98:10 <b>noted (2)</b> 18:25;53:12 <b>notice (169)</b> 6:15;21:11,16;42:22, 24;43:5,5,9,12,15,16, 19;44:6,7,16,16,19,19, 23;45:2,9,15;46:1,2,4, 6,9,12,15,16;47:6,8,8, 11,16,19;48:5,9,24; 49:4,4,7,8,9,11,19; 51:4,23;53:19,21; 54:17,18,22,23,24; 55:12,23;56:2,2,12,13, 15,16,20,22;57:9,15; 59:20;61:4,5,9,9,17,17, 19,24;62:18,23;63:6,8, 22;64:24;65:12,13; 66:2,12,19;67:3,5,12, 22,25;68:14,19;69:2,3, 8,16;70:3,12,12;77:25; 78:1,4,23,23;79:8,13; 80:6,8,13;82:22;85:9; 87:16,16;88:15;89:14, 17;90:4,6,11,14,21; 91:2;92:14,15,20,22, 24;93:1,10;94:5,13,18; 95:22,23;97:6,16,19, 22;98:6,15,24;99:3,6, 10,10;102:12,22,23,23; 106:21;107:1,5,20; 108:3;109:6;111:4,11, 12;112:5,14,17,20; 115:11;116:7,22; 118:2,15 <b>notice' (2)</b> 53:23;78:11 <b>notice-intermediary (1)</b> 45:17 <b>notice-party (1)</b> 45:24 <b>notices (10)</b> 44:22;48:9;61:18; 69:17;70:14;79:4,23; 98:11;107:19;108:25 <b>noticing (10)</b> 55:7;57:25;58:1; 97:9,11;99:11;108:16, 21;109:4,7 <b>notify (3)</b> 89:9;100:20;103:22 <b>notifying (2)</b> 89:24;103:1 <b>notion (3)</b> 20:6;64:25;68:19 <b>Notwithstanding (3)</b> 7:20;28:19;29:17 <b>novel (1)</b> 8:20	<b>number (16)</b> 6:5;7:7;11:25;12:5; 17:10;45:17,18;54:11; 82:24;87:24;89:6; 100:12;102:16;104:11; 109:13;111:6 <b>numbers (12)</b> 87:19,21;88:2,3,25; 89:7,8,20;92:4;107:14; 114:6,6 <b>numerous (3)</b> 27:14;42:15;43:22  <b>O</b>  <b>oath (1)</b> 74:10 <b>obfuscating (1)</b> 88:6 <b>object (7)</b> 20:5,7;23:12;31:20; 46:1,12;92:13 <b>objecting (2)</b> 15:14;54:10 <b>objection (35)</b> 8:25;15:1;17:10,13, 25;18:24;19:5,6,8; 20:1,5;21:3;23:4; 26:12;31:24;35:16; 45:20,20;46:18;47:12, 18;48:16;52:11,13; 54:10;59:21;75:20; 78:20;83:22;87:11; 92:14;95:20;98:17; 99:16;100:24 <b>objections (24)</b> 9:1;15:2;17:6;18:25; 20:15;31:6;43:22,24; 45:15,16,17,18,23,24; 46:11,22;59:20;75:14, 22;87:3,4;100:7,11; 109:13 <b>objectors (1)</b> 17:8 <b>obligated (2)</b> 71:8;98:11 <b>obligation (7)</b> 29:20;33:22;37:22; 44:15;48:14;57:17; 97:12 <b>obligations (5)</b> 13:1;43:3,4;56:14; 59:5 <b>oblique (1)</b> 68:22 <b>observation (2)</b> 32:8;65:11 <b>observations (1)</b> 43:23 <b>observed (1)</b> 71:10 <b>obtain (3)</b> 82:21;90:16;91:25	<b>obtained (2)</b> 28:8,16 <b>obtaining (1)</b> 12:11 <b>obvious (7)</b> 10:15,16,17,22; 11:22;47:22;48:21 <b>obviously (4)</b> 19:1,7;45:10;71:10 <b>OCC (5)</b> 9:24;76:21;114:14, 15,19 <b>occasion (1)</b> 24:18 <b>occasions (1)</b> 113:19 <b>occur (1)</b> 58:18 <b>occurred (1)</b> 33:9 <b>O'Connell (1)</b> 54:10 <b>October (6)</b> 44:1,1;67:16;71:3; 73:22;82:8 <b>odd (1)</b> 19:10 <b>off (7)</b> 11:20;19:16;20:14; 60:1;65:2;73:13; 118:20 <b>offer (2)</b> 33:21;95:9 <b>office (5)</b> 31:16;60:24;63:21; 92:19;101:16 <b>official (5)</b> 7:3;8:11;31:3;72:17; 79:19 <b>old (2)</b> 10:11,12 <b>older (1)</b> 12:14 <b>once (4)</b> 81:22;82:10;114:14, 15 <b>one (75)</b> 10:4,11,19;11:8; 12:1;14:15;15:1,14,18; 17:5,7,11;18:18;19:10, 12;20:1;25:5;26:6; 30:12;32:25,25;35:25; 36:1,2,14;38:6;46:1; 49:13;53:5;54:9;56:22; 62:7;63:10,16;64:2,7, 12,18;65:10;68:10,10; 69:6;71:12;75:5;76:14, 23;78:15,19;81:3;82:4; 89:19;90:7;92:4,9,17, 19;93:2;94:24;95:2,20; 96:18;103:5,9;104:8; 105:5;108:25,25; 109:4,6,23;110:15;	113:21;114:2,13; 118:19 <b>O'NEIL (2)</b> 22:14,15 <b>ones (2)</b> 69:6;74:2 <b>one-year (1)</b> 13:14 <b>ongoing (1)</b> 73:5 <b>only (27)</b> 10:2;13:12;18:14; 21:25;23:10;24:15; 39:21;44:18;45:8; 48:22;56:16;66:6; 68:13;70:1;74:14; 81:22;87:20;88:11,24; 92:16;100:17;115:10; 117:15;118:4,9,21; 119:10 <b>onto (2)</b> 99:10,13 <b>open (9)</b> 28:13,14;42:8,13; 47:23,24;48:2;95:8; 117:13 <b>open-ended (2)</b> 54:20;56:24 <b>opening (1)</b> 56:9 <b>operations (1)</b> 54:9 <b>opined (3)</b> 97:17,18,19 <b>opinion (4)</b> 42:4;50:3;55:21; 63:15 <b>opinions (1)</b> 55:20 <b>opportunity (9)</b> 30:17;33:11;35:4; 59:16;80:7;83:20; 110:12;116:15;119:7 <b>opposition (2)</b> 23:15;88:10 <b>option (2)</b> 84:5;111:16 <b>order (75)</b> 6:9,12;12:20;15:9, 22;22:17,20,21,22; 23:4,9,17;24:9,24; 26:20;39:18,25;41:10, 11;43:8;45:12,13; 46:21,23,24;47:1,3,3,5; 48:17,17,18,21;49:1,3, 3,14,19;50:1;52:9; 55:23;63:3,3;67:17; 71:6;81:5;82:4,23,25; 83:4;91:16;94:13; 105:4;107:1,20; 108:12,13,15;109:20; 111:3,13,14;112:12,13, 25;113:1,11;115:9,9;
--	---	---	---	---

119:9,11;120:9,17,18, 20 <b>ordered (2)</b> 85:5;92:16 <b>ordering (1)</b> 111:3 <b>orderly (1)</b> 8:1 <b>orders (5)</b> 34:15;46:21;47:2; 49:25;115:4 <b>order's (1)</b> 113:15 <b>ordinary (1)</b> 6:10 <b>ordinary-course (1)</b> 26:6 <b>original (2)</b> 102:6;112:9 <b>Originally (4)</b> 27:23;42:20;54:24; 55:4 <b>others (9)</b> 15:11,12;17:1;18:8; 24:3;31:7;44:14;46:15; 76:23 <b>others' (1)</b> 35:10 <b>otherwise (9)</b> 25:3;49:2,25;50:1; 72:1;85:5;95:23;96:6; 97:11 <b>ought (11)</b> 107:9,12,18,20; 108:2,7;111:10,20; 112:6,10;114:5 <b>out (52)</b> 20:12;21:10;22:10; 30:4;47:20;50:10;51:7; 53:9,24;54:13;56:18, 21;61:5,18;62:9,10,13, 14,15,25;64:8,14,22; 65:16,17,21;66:19; 68:6;69:13,16,17;70:4, 23;71:9;75:24;76:19; 80:2;81:15;87:2;91:22; 98:7;100:11;102:5,17; 104:3,12;105:14; 112:18;113:11;114:15; 116:1,3 <b>outbreak (2)</b> 88:19;89:5 <b>outline (1)</b> 7:25 <b>outlined (1)</b> 28:2 <b>Outpatient (3)</b> 11:1;17:9;24:3 <b>outreach (1)</b> 77:20 <b>outset (2)</b> 15:7;23:22 <b>outside (2)</b>	100:21;101:6 <b>over (17)</b> 7:10;10:18,18,23; 15:13;21:23;43:17; 44:17;46:11;47:7,16; 59:3;79:20;98:6; 102:11;107:9;112:14 <b>overabundance (1)</b> 30:16 <b>overall (1)</b> 23:8 <b>overcome (1)</b> 24:9 <b>overexuberant (1)</b> 58:21 <b>overlaid (1)</b> 42:4 <b>overlap (2)</b> 71:10,13 <b>overpaying (1)</b> 38:9 <b>overriding (3)</b> 38:8,18,23 <b>overwhelming (1)</b> 75:16 <b>owe (3)</b> 18:10,10,16 <b>owed (2)</b> 22:4;24:11 <b>own (13)</b> 13:5;28:9,17;36:13; 45:21;54:23,24;64:15; 83:6;97:16,20,24; 112:11 <b>owners (1)</b> 91:1	53:13;63:14;75:8,10; 79:15;81:11;82:4,5; 83:10;84:3,10;104:18; 113:2 <b>participant (1)</b> 68:7 <b>participate (4)</b> 69:20,21;84:7; 109:20 <b>participating (1)</b> 35:10 <b>participation (2)</b> 7:21;73:3 <b>particular (9)</b> 13:3,11;24:16;49:18; 55:5;84:17;85:3;88:17; 108:3 <b>particularly (3)</b> 26:11;36:19;62:22 <b>particulars (1)</b> 59:9 <b>parties (37)</b> 14:19;15:14,25;31:7; 35:14;42:11,17;43:9; 46:12;54:10;56:6;74:4, 7;90:10,12,14;91:9; 95:20;97:13,15,23; 99:13;106:9;107:5; 108:6,7;109:5;111:23; 114:18;116:1,15,24; 117:18;118:6,8; 119:16;120:13 <b>parties' (1)</b> 118:20 <b>party (7)</b> 11:15;17:22;46:6; 49:8;79:7;91:10;96:5 <b>party-in-interest (1)</b> 83:20 <b>past (2)</b> 7:11;32:10 <b>path (3)</b> 67:19,23;69:3 <b>patience (1)</b> 7:13 <b>patient (16)</b> 46:13;79:10;87:16, 25;89:6,10,17;91:25; 93:19;94:1;96:25; 101:2;103:10;104:6,6, 18 <b>patients (34)</b> 43:11;44:8;46:6; 88:2,11,18,21,22; 89:10,16,21,22;90:3,5, 7;91:4;92:2,8;93:1,9, 13;94:4,16;96:11;99:7; 100:23;101:3;102:9; 103:1,7,19,21;107:22; 120:12 <b>patients' (1)</b> 104:9 <b>pattern (1)</b>	93:8 <b>Paul (1)</b> 6:25 <b>Paula (5)</b> 6:22;31:13;35:3; 82:18;94:21 <b>Pause (3)</b> 30:14;73:24;105:11 <b>pay (1)</b> 64:17 <b>paying (3)</b> 33:19;38:13;39:9 <b>payment (4)</b> 35:6;47:24;77:21; 84:23 <b>payments (2)</b> 29:19;36:7 <b>peculiar (1)</b> 55:1 <b>pencil (1)</b> 15:19 <b>penciled-in (1)</b> 16:4 <b>pending (2)</b> 26:13;74:24 <b>people (69)</b> 26:10;38:3;39:13; 42:18;43:4,12,19,19; 44:9,11,17,24;45:5; 47:11,15;48:7,8,8,22, 24;50:23;51:17;53:20; 56:19,22;57:1;59:15; 61:8;62:18,23;63:6,11, 13;65:8,14;66:8,13; 68:15;69:17;70:7,18, 20,24,24;71:24;73:5; 74:13;75:23;78:15,17, 22,24;79:3;80:18;81:1, 7;82:1;102:12,18; 103:8,16;105:1; 106:16,18,21;107:19; 112:18;114:5;119:12 <b>people's (4)</b> 64:3;66:14;68:20; 113:25 <b>perceive (1)</b> 99:12 <b>perceives (1)</b> 59:10 <b>percent (1)</b> 89:16 <b>perception (1)</b> 83:25 <b>perfect (1)</b> 80:10 <b>perfectly (2)</b> 29:16,21 <b>perhaps (15)</b> 8:16,17;14:8;17:8; 26:7;30:15;48:20; 54:15;58:20;59:16; 74:4;75:1,13;110:15; 118:15	<b>period (7)</b> 21:16;40:19;47:25; 53:25;82:9;88:7;107:9 <b>periods (1)</b> 109:14 <b>permit (2)</b> 60:14;79:8 <b>persisted (1)</b> 77:16 <b>person (3)</b> 27:19;76:3;95:10 <b>personal (4)</b> 43:1;83:13;106:3,6 <b>personal-injury (8)</b> 6:14;15:4;42:3;53:6, 8;80:15;91:21,22 <b>persons (1)</b> 106:16 <b>person's (2)</b> 68:11,11 <b>perspective (5)</b> 23:18;32:12;99:4,17; 105:14 <b>ph (5)</b> 57:24;72:10;90:16, 17;120:11 <b>Pharmacist (5)</b> 27:5,13;32:9,23; 33:16 <b>Pharmacy (1)</b> 6:6 <b>philosophically (1)</b> 68:18 <b>phone (18)</b> 15:13;19:22;20:3; 22:13;32:3;60:18,19; 63:11;70:24;72:7,12; 75:23;81:8;86:25;93:5; 95:17;99:19;111:23 <b>phonetically (1)</b> 77:18 <b>phrased (1)</b> 34:11 <b>physicians (1)</b> 104:17 <b>piece (1)</b> 75:14 <b>pieces (1)</b> 79:5 <b>Pioneer (3)</b> 110:1,1,13 <b>PITWD (1)</b> 107:25 <b>place (6)</b> 11:3;21:1;33:10; 42:25;47:4;101:20 <b>placed (1)</b> 95:5 <b>places (6)</b> 23:4;70:21,23,25; 71:2;111:19 <b>plaintiff (2)</b> 33:22;111:9
	<b>P</b>			
	<b>page (1)</b> 20:6 <b>paid (6)</b> 29:17,24;30:7;36:20; 42:3;84:21 <b>pain (5)</b> 10:3,3;44:3;54:10; 120:8 <b>paints (1)</b> 108:9 <b>paper (2)</b> 75:14;95:11 <b>papers (5)</b> 7:20;21:4;27:18; 61:11;101:25 <b>paragraph (8)</b> 15:17;19:2;83:1,12; 84:14,15,20;85:1 <b>paramount (2)</b> 39:4;101:17 <b>pardon (1)</b> 117:8 <b>part (16)</b> 12:6;22:4;35:7;			



<b>plaintiffs (6)</b> 11:18;14:2;21:15; 23:5;90:12,16	<b>population (2)</b> 66:17;70:25	<b>pre-judge (1)</b> 17:24	107:22;118:25	<b>professionals' (1)</b> 29:5
<b>plaintiffs' (6)</b> 11:19;12:2;27:16; 39:24;69:10;92:11	<b>position (22)</b> 17:14;21:18;31:23; 34:13,13,25;36:13; 47:14;60:6;61:11; 62:22,25;63:16;65:18; 67:9,9,11;91:20;95:10; 100:13;101:25;104:22	<b>prejudice (1)</b> 23:21	<b>problem (10)</b> 30:20;34:17,22; 65:14;70:3;86:6; 108:11;109:13;110:5; 113:22	<b>proffered (1)</b> 104:4
<b>plan (19)</b> 42:1;53:13,17;55:13, 19;56:5,7;66:6,7,7,7, 18;67:24;68:15;80:3,4; 104:21;108:23;118:19	<b>positions (1)</b> 18:18	<b>prejudiced (1)</b> 110:4	<b>problems (3)</b> 12:4;29:8;43:25	<b>program (5)</b> 66:23;67:13,13,22; 68:14
<b>plan' (1)</b> 66:11	<b>possession (1)</b> 103:13	<b>prepare (5)</b> 41:24;51:24;104:20, 23;108:14	<b>procedural (2)</b> 17:17;98:2	<b>progressed (1)</b> 109:24
<b>plane (1)</b> 8:3	<b>possesses (1)</b> 27:12	<b>prepared (10)</b> 29:17,22;34:15,20; 35:9,14;51:22;52:9; 57:22;59:14	<b>procedurally (1)</b> 96:3	<b>promotes (1)</b> 23:20
<b>planned (1)</b> 65:8	<b>possibility (1)</b> 42:13	<b>pre-petition (1)</b> 27:7	<b>procedure (4)</b> 42:25;43:7,13;57:11	<b>prone (1)</b> 62:21
<b>planning (1)</b> 68:16	<b>possible (10)</b> 15:8;23:9;24:23; 42:17,18;48:3;56:5; 59:8;78:1,4	<b>prescribed (1)</b> 92:21	<b>procedures (3)</b> 6:14;59:18;98:21	<b>proof (8)</b> 20:10;76:24;83:9,17; 84:9;93:10;95:9; 104:19
<b>Plant (1)</b> 38:17	<b>possibly (4)</b> 60:13;61:5;66:9; 80:19	<b>present (4)</b> 6:20;8:22;13:12; 15:14	<b>proceeding (11)</b> 15:24;16:4,7,8,16, 18;22:18;71:17;74:19; 76:10;108:17	<b>proofs (8)</b> 6:12;51:11,14;83:5; 84:22,24;95:5;113:1
<b>played (1)</b> 75:24	<b>potential (20)</b> 18:5;45:6;54:4; 55:13;58:7;74:6;75:6; 87:9,12,18,22;88:16; 89:5;90:3;91:4,9;92:8; 94:9,17;102:17	<b>presentation (1)</b> 63:18	<b>proceedings (2)</b> 52:17;119:17	<b>proper (1)</b> 82:22
<b>plays (2)</b> 56:21;113:18	<b>potentially (5)</b> 48:13;55:8;74:7; 90:13,13	<b>presented (2)</b> 82:25;87:13	<b>proceeds (2)</b> 23:25;106:2	<b>properly (1)</b> 83:15
<b>pleading (1)</b> 31:18	<b>power (5)</b> 50:6,7;57:11,16,17	<b>preserve (2)</b> 34:9;101:18	<b>process (35)</b> 7:22;12:7,9,9,11; 44:18;46:7;48:12; 51:14;52:18,25;53:1; 55:7;56:21;57:5,14,15, 21;58:1;64:11;67:25; 69:11,13;70:16;71:7; 73:9,10;74:3;75:15; 76:5;77:2,4;79:17; 83:22;102:8	<b>property (1)</b> 96:5
<b>pleadings (3)</b> 10:9;43:21;120:10	<b>practical (1)</b> 79:9	<b>pre-suit (2)</b> 21:11,16	<b>produce (3)</b> 107:10,12;112:6	<b>proposal (1)</b> 58:19
<b>Please (5)</b> 6:3,20;15:16;40:17; 60:3	<b>practicing (1)</b> 71:24	<b>presumption (1)</b> 83:4	<b>produced (3)</b> 75:17;87:22;107:11	<b>propose (3)</b> 25:18;27:22;53:14
<b>plenty (1)</b> 79:23	<b>pre-approve (1)</b> 61:17	<b>presumptuous (1)</b> 34:21	<b>product (19)</b> 12:6;17:11;43:16; 44:8,11;54:11,16;71:2; 73:18;75:11;78:10; 87:17,24;88:14;89:6, 18;92:21;107:8,9	<b>proposed (15)</b> 22:17;27:23,25,25; 29:8;43:24,25;44:6; 51:6;59:18;66:2;82:23; 111:3;112:19;113:1
<b>PLLC (1)</b> 6:8	<b>precludes (1)</b> 18:18	<b>pretty (4)</b> 10:17;78:21,25;94:9	<b>product-liability (1)</b> 11:4	<b>proposes (4)</b> 57:25;58:1,14,18
<b>plural (1)</b> 71:18	<b>pre-Code (1)</b> 8:15	<b>prevailing (1)</b> 38:15	<b>products (20)</b> 20:21;21:10;22:3; 43:11;44:5,14;56:16; 61:8;78:13;87:21;88:3, 8,12,17;89:8;93:22; 101:4,5;106:17;108:20	<b>proposing (2)</b> 45:25;51:10
<b>pm (4)</b> 6:1;60:1,2;120:24	<b>prefer (8)</b> 25:1;39:7,8;46:8; 47:16;110:8,20;111:17	<b>prevent (1)</b> 56:5	<b>products-liability (1)</b> 11:5	<b>proposition (1)</b> 61:7
<b>PMIC (1)</b> 30:4	<b>preference (5)</b> 24:19;25:2;50:9,14, 16	<b>previously (4)</b> 16:10;44:23;66:16; 74:5	<b>professionally (1)</b> 63:8	<b>prospect (1)</b> 117:13
<b>POC (3)</b> 83:18;84:12;95:14	<b>preferred (1)</b> 16:13	<b>primary (5)</b> 18:6;74:2;77:24; 106:4,5	<b>professional (5)</b> 36:22;61:9;62:10; 63:7;69:23	<b>protect (2)</b> 42:25;95:10
<b>POCs (1)</b> 84:2	<b>pre-filing (2)</b> 12:18;17:18	<b>principals (1)</b> 91:2	<b>professional-retention (1)</b> 7:17	<b>protecting (1)</b> 38:16
<b>point (30)</b> 17:12;20:10;27:19; 29:11,15;48:20;53:18; 55:15;56:1;63:19; 66:10,21;67:20;68:17; 69:5;77:23;78:9;81:3; 94:7,24;96:16;100:9, 17;102:5,19;103:6,20, 23;104:3;105:12		<b>prior (4)</b> 28:20;35:13;43:17; 49:23	<b>professionals (2)</b> 26:6;29:2	<b>protection (1)</b> 95:5
<b>pointing (1)</b> 90:17		<b>priority (2)</b> 39:2;52:2		<b>protective (2)</b> 46:23,24
<b>points (2)</b> 99:15;102:21		<b>privacy (1)</b> 46:13		<b>protects (1)</b> 68:20
<b>policy (4)</b> 27:7;29:19,21;30:8		<b>privilege (3)</b> 29:11;30:19;120:12		<b>proud (1)</b> 81:16
<b>popular (1)</b> 17:3		<b>privileged (1)</b> 28:22		<b>proves (1)</b> 53:20
		<b>privileges (1)</b> 28:12		<b>provide (17)</b> 27:6;43:4,44:16,24; 45:9;50:1;52:10;65:13; 82:22;83:23;88:1; 89:17;92:16;97:6,16; 98:11;99:6

<p><b>provided (14)</b> 15:21;29:9;32:22; 35:5;42:21,23;44:2; 49:22;65:22;84:7;85:1; 90:1,6;112:10</p> <p><b>provider (7)</b> 21:6;61:18,19,25; 88:1;93:25;96:14</p> <p><b>providers (14)</b> 18:2;20:22;43:10; 44:4;87:3;90:24;91:15; 17:92:2;93:4,17;94:16; 100:14;101:1</p> <p><b>provides (7)</b> 47:5;49:15;52:8; 57:21;81:7;88:15; 93:25</p> <p><b>providing (9)</b> 22:2;23:10;50:5; 71:8;99:3;103:10,18; 105:14;120:12</p> <p><b>provision (5)</b> 21:6;35:19;47:1; 90:20;95:3</p> <p><b>provisions (2)</b> 45:10;90:14</p> <p><b>PSC (64)</b> 45:20;52:11,14,15; 53:2,5;54:22;55:11,12; 56:13,17;57:19,24; 58:18,20;59:2,9,9; 61:6;62:17;63:10,21, 24;64:7;69:21;72:8; 73:11,15,20;75:12; 76:19,22;77:9;78:25; 79:16;80:17;81:20; 87:8,10,12,15;88:4,9, 14;89:22;90:1,10,15, 16,22;91:3,14,19;92:6; 94:7;99:25;107:11,11; 108:17,22;109:3; 112:1,15;114:19</p> <p><b>PSC's (9)</b> 52:22;55:10;57:4; 59:21;67:9;78:20; 79:11;89:13;101:25</p> <p><b>public (16)</b> 51:14;52:4;81:14; 83:4,10,19,24;84:3,10, 12;95:7,14;104:3; 113:2,21;114:4</p> <p><b>public-access-to-papers (1)</b> 95:3</p> <p><b>publication (3)</b> 44:2;54:17;97:22</p> <p><b>publications (1)</b> 44:3</p> <p><b>publicity (1)</b> 54:13</p> <p><b>publish (1)</b> 42:24</p> <p><b>published (1)</b> 111:12</p>	<p><b>purchase (1)</b> 75:11</p> <p><b>purpose (3)</b> 15:2;69:2;94:3</p> <p><b>purposes (5)</b> 52:21;64:1;69:18; 114:5;120:19</p> <p><b>pursuant (4)</b> 21:7;26:5;46:20; 98:4</p> <p><b>pursuit (1)</b> 64:13</p> <p><b>pushed (1)</b> 91:14</p> <p><b>put (15)</b> 21:4;41:10;47:14; 49:19;51:17;67:23,24; 71:20;76:10;95:10; 97:25;104:15;107:17; 113:22;120:20</p> <p><b>puts (1)</b> 97:11</p> <p><b>putting (1)</b> 19:18</p>	<p>110:7</p> <p><b>rationale (1)</b> 120:2</p> <p><b>rationales (1)</b> 104:4</p> <p><b>re (1)</b> 38:17</p> <p><b>reach (5)</b> 42:16;73:20,23; 113:15,20</p> <p><b>reached (1)</b> 100:10</p> <p><b>reaching (1)</b> 87:2</p> <p><b>read (7)</b> 11:23,23;15:12;16:4; 23:9;73:18;76:11</p> <p><b>readily (3)</b> 44:25;45:1;48:25</p> <p><b>reading (2)</b> 39:6;76:20</p> <p><b>reads (1)</b> 111:16</p> <p><b>ready (2)</b> 32:11;35:20</p> <p><b>real (12)</b> 19:13;57:1;60:9; 63:5;65:4,14,14,15; 73:1;74:10;81:12,14</p> <p><b>realities (1)</b> 79:9</p> <p><b>really (19)</b> 10:21;11:22;34:17; 61:1;63:4;65:1;67:2; 68:21;74:6;75:4;77:23; 78:12;94:8;95:9; 102:17,18;103:24; 107:16;114:16</p> <p><b>realm (1)</b> 95:14</p> <p><b>reason (16)</b> 38:5;46:8;54:19; 59:13;65:24;69:25; 71:4;74:1;76:22;83:19; 92:25;93:24;95:13; 102:18;103:17;112:7</p> <p><b>reasonable (7)</b> 35:7;36:10;38:24; 48:23;59:19;82:9;99:6</p> <p><b>reasonableness (2)</b> 36:3;40:1</p> <p><b>reasonably (2)</b> 42:23;44:10</p> <p><b>reasons (16)</b> 13:7;22:10,10;23:19; 27:17;41:22;46:19; 47:22;62:20;69:24,25; 75:1;94:10,11;96:10; 98:14</p> <p><b>rebuttable (1)</b> 83:4</p> <p><b>recall (5)</b> 34:12;44:22;48:9;</p>	<p>70:12,14</p> <p><b>Recano (3)</b> 54:23;55:4;99:11</p> <p><b>Recano's (2)</b> 55:3,6</p> <p><b>receipt (1)</b> 75:25</p> <p><b>receive (7)</b> 61:9;88:8;100:15,16, 18,25;112:12</p> <p><b>received (18)</b> 43:16;44:8,11,14; 54:15,16;56:16;61:8; 89:17;92:3,9;93:2,2; 100:23;101:4,4; 106:17;112:4</p> <p><b>receiving (1)</b> 93:19</p> <p><b>recently (1)</b> 57:12</p> <p><b>recess (1)</b> 59:25</p> <p><b>recipient (1)</b> 94:1</p> <p><b>recipients (2)</b> 44:22;70:6</p> <p><b>reckless (1)</b> 89:20</p> <p><b>recognized (1)</b> 55:6</p> <p><b>recognizes (2)</b> 51:12;68:7</p> <p><b>recommendation (2)</b> 69:22;91:5</p> <p><b>recommends (1)</b> 109:4</p> <p><b>recompense (2)</b> 73:4;81:2</p> <p><b>reconsideration (2)</b> 40:18,19</p> <p><b>record (13)</b> 17:20;20:10;32:2; 36:15;60:1,2;62:15; 72:20;83:10;84:10; 104:3;113:2,21</p> <p><b>records (10)</b> 36:13;55:1;83:7; 84:3;92:21;95:7;97:16, 20,20,24</p> <p><b>recoveries (2)</b> 24:19;118:6</p> <p><b>recovery (1)</b> 109:17</p> <p><b>redaction (1)</b> 51:20</p> <p><b>redone (1)</b> 105:3</p> <p><b>reduce (2)</b> 77:7;79:18</p> <p><b>reducing (1)</b> 104:24</p> <p><b>refer (1)</b> 15:17</p>	<p><b>reference (7)</b> 84:20;85:4;91:11; 94:5;105:19;110:25; 113:1</p> <p><b>referenced (3)</b> 40:9;75:18;83:12</p> <p><b>referred (3)</b> 16:10;27:8;29:19</p> <p><b>referring (1)</b> 95:4</p> <p><b>reflect (3)</b> 22:21;93:19;94:4</p> <p><b>refused (1)</b> 69:21</p> <p><b>regard (6)</b> 14:1;17:21;32:21; 79:24;80:7,24</p> <p><b>regarding (1)</b> 85:1</p> <p><b>regardless (2)</b> 52:12;118:19</p> <p><b>regards (1)</b> 102:4</p> <p><b>regime (1)</b> 53:19</p> <p><b>regionally (1)</b> 54:14</p> <p><b>registered (1)</b> 27:13</p> <p><b>regularity (1)</b> 113:24</p> <p><b>regulate (1)</b> 49:11</p> <p><b>Regulations (1)</b> 46:24</p> <p><b>reimburse (1)</b> 47:15</p> <p><b>reimbursed (1)</b> 46:2</p> <p><b>reimbursement (7)</b> 36:9;38:21,22;39:2; 99:1,8;107:21</p> <p><b>reintroducing (1)</b> 8:8</p> <p><b>reiterate (2)</b> 89:3;101:24</p> <p><b>reject (1)</b> 70:1</p> <p><b>rejected (1)</b> 98:16</p> <p><b>Relafen (1)</b> 77:17</p> <p><b>relapses (1)</b> 104:13</p> <p><b>relate (2)</b> 87:19;88:24</p> <p><b>related (8)</b> 7:18;21:4,6;26:5; 57:5;84:15;89:25; 99:10</p> <p><b>related-to (1)</b> 15:25</p> <p><b>relates (5)</b></p>
---	---	---	---	--

17:6;95:2;102:1,1; 103:18 <b>relating (2)</b> 74:24;88:19 <b>relationship (2)</b> 32:9;36:25 <b>relatively (2)</b> 32:24;106:11 <b>release (5)</b> 66:23;67:13;91:18; 112:8,9 <b>releases (12)</b> 55:14,16,22;65:1; 66:8;68:19;117:2,5,7,9, 17;118:12 <b>relevant (1)</b> 28:16 <b>relief (10)</b> 6:16;14:9,13,24; 15:3;19:3;20:17;83:2; 96:2,5 <b>relieved (1)</b> 33:21 <b>rely (1)</b> 88:10 <b>relying (2)</b> 31:22;35:16 <b>remain (4)</b> 51:11,12;63:14; 95:14 <b>remainder (1)</b> 20:15 <b>remaining (9)</b> 7:25;9:1;42:8;45:23, 23;48:15;98:18;99:1; 113:2 <b>remarkable (1)</b> 26:13 <b>remedy (3)</b> 20:18,18;21:5 <b>Remember (1)</b> 64:1 <b>reminded (1)</b> 93:13 <b>reminding (1)</b> 105:16 <b>removal (2)</b> 16:6,17 <b>remove (1)</b> 16:11 <b>removed (4)</b> 16:3,8;23:6;91:12 <b>rendered (1)</b> 49:22 <b>rendering (1)</b> 36:23 <b>repeat (2)</b> 19:2;101:24 <b>replete (1)</b> 104:16 <b>report (1)</b> 114:15 <b>reported (3)</b>	13:10;23:24;71:1 <b>reports (3)</b> 74:11,12,15 <b>represent (15)</b> 6:21;8:23;9:20;13:2, 3,4;27:19;28:1;33:5; 70:17;81:19;95:19; 100:5;103:15;120:7 <b>representation (4)</b> 20:4;28:20;31:18; 91:8 <b>represented (4)</b> 6:10;27:24;90:22; 102:6 <b>representing (7)</b> 6:25;7:6;33:10; 41:12;72:8;104:11; 105:1 <b>represents (1)</b> 86:21 <b>request (18)</b> 14:17;40:2;70:11; 81:7;83:9,21;84:2,8, 12;85:16;92:14;94:3, 12,17;98:15,19;99:5; 107:21 <b>requested (9)</b> 30:17;43:13;57:10; 82:23;83:2,18;85:6; 108:12;120:24 <b>requesting (1)</b> 95:22 <b>requests (4)</b> 14:17,20;41:21; 90:15 <b>require (11)</b> 36:21;43:14;49:13; 74:10;93:17;103:19, 21;104:5,6,18;105:6 <b>required (17)</b> 34:4,18;37:21;39:6; 44:7,23;47:24;88:1; 89:9;90:21;93:5,9,15; 94:3;105:3;106:14; 107:10 <b>requirement (4)</b> 12:18;17:18;94:18; 97:19 <b>requirements (5)</b> 6:13;21:16;96:20; 105:24;115:3 <b>requires (7)</b> 14:15;21:22;35:19; 39:19;49:4;68:1;74:9 <b>requiring (8)</b> 38:10;46:4;49:14; 90:10;98:24;100:20; 101:3;114:17 <b>resembling (1)</b> 56:10 <b>reserving (1)</b> 36:8 <b>resolution (6)</b>	10:1;19:5;32:19,20; 50:11;56:25 <b>resolve (2)</b> 87:4;107:2 <b>resolved (8)</b> 7:24;8:25;29:8; 37:21;45:14,25;59:19; 98:20 <b>resolves (1)</b> 23:4 <b>resolving (2)</b> 7:22;42:8 <b>resources (1)</b> 67:6 <b>respect (37)</b> 7:23;8:14;18:8; 22:16,22;23:1;24:2,4, 13;26:17;27:15;28:2; 29:2,6;30:18,25;31:20; 36:13;40:8;44:5;47:12; 60:6;67:11;76:7;81:6; 83:1,3,11,17;87:3;95:7, 10;98:15,19,24;100:5; 108:23 <b>respectfully (7)</b> 20:4,9,24;21:22; 22:5,9;94:12 <b>respects (3)</b> 14:15;72:25;73:17 <b>respond (4)</b> 71:7;89:13;104:20; 116:20 <b>responded (1)</b> 10:9 <b>responding (2)</b> 14:20;70:11 <b>response (8)</b> 20:6;22:10;26:18; 43:24;46:19,25;81:6; 96:17 <b>responsibility (3)</b> 24:22;60:25;112:9 <b>responsible (5)</b> 31:8;74:14;90:11; 103:1;109:8 <b>rest (2)</b> 102:20;105:10 <b>restrictions (2)</b> 29:4;47:4 <b>result (6)</b> 9:22;52:13;53:2; 93:11;105:23;109:23 <b>results (1)</b> 70:20 <b>retain (5)</b> 6:7;26:4,5;27:4,22 <b>retained (3)</b> 27:5;28:4;30:4 <b>retention (5)</b> 27:23;29:13;31:16, 25;35:16 <b>return (3)</b> 62:12;70:8,21	<b>reveals (2)</b> 52:24;59:9 <b>reversal (1)</b> 12:3 <b>reverse (1)</b> 82:25 <b>review (7)</b> 28:9;30:17;31:20; 35:5,20;36:24;51:19 <b>reviewing (1)</b> 35:1 <b>revise (1)</b> 22:20 <b>revised (6)</b> 29:14;41:11;94:4,13; 112:19;116:7 <b>revision (1)</b> 15:9 <b>Richard (1)</b> 33:15 <b>rid (1)</b> 55:2 <b>right (48)</b> 6:19;9:10;16:23; 19:25;23:2;25:5;26:7, 19;33:2;34:24;36:8; 39:17;40:13,19;41:14; 59:24,25;60:5;62:4,8,8, 19;63:13;64:1,16,17; 65:7,19,21;66:1,13; 68:13,24;70:15;72:13, 15;83:5;93:19;96:4; 99:20;102:12;105:13; 115:12;117:4,6,12; 119:20;120:3 <b>rights (17)</b> 34:9;37:18;65:2,16; 66:15,20;68:20,23; 71:14;76:24;108:6; 116:24;117:15;118:8, 9,16,20 <b>ringer (1)</b> 19:19 <b>ripe (1)</b> 24:5 <b>rise (3)</b> 6:2;60:3;81:14 <b>risk (12)</b> 23:5,7;38:6,14; 87:25;88:23;89:6,11, 24;90:3,5;93:13 <b>risks (1)</b> 37:4 <b>road (2)</b> 12:4;14:6 <b>role (7)</b> 52:25;53:1;57:3,4; 59:10,11;113:17 <b>romanette (6)</b> 15:19,20,21;16:6,9, 10 <b>Ron (1)</b> 95:18	<b>room (2)</b> 65:6,7 <b>Ropes (1)</b> 114:11 <b>round (1)</b> 67:5 <b>routine (1)</b> 62:19 <b>Rudnick (5)</b> 7:3;8:11;72:20;74:3; 81:21 <b>rule (19)</b> 20:25;40:1;49:6,10, 20,24;50:4,5,9,22; 52:16;58:23;61:16; 64:10,20;85:4,13;95:7; 96:2 <b>Rules (5)</b> 39:21;52:18;57:11; 74:9;109:11 <b>ruling (8)</b> 36:23;40:2,14;76:8; 85:14;86:15;91:24; 120:9 <b>rulings (1)</b> 14:12
<b>S</b>				
				<b>Safe (2)</b> 25:16;72:14 <b>sake (1)</b> 112:11 <b>sales (1)</b> 90:25 <b>same (7)</b> 18:2;19:1;48:8; 52:20,21;84:8;97:25 <b>sat (3)</b> 63:21;64:8,9 <b>satisfied (4)</b> 19:6;40:21;108:15; 110:20 <b>satisfies (1)</b> 120:18 <b>save (2)</b> 12:19;115:14 <b>saved (1)</b> 101:22 <b>saying (2)</b> 61:24;68:3 <b>Saylor (15)</b> 42:5;57:9;63:3; 64:11,20;71:11;75:24; 76:6,17,25;77:14,21; 90:2;98:1;107:12 <b>Saylor's (1)</b> 81:12 <b>scandalous (1)</b> 95:11 <b>scheduling (1)</b> 7:11 <b>scope (6)</b>

92:5;94:8;98:22,22; 100:21;101:6 <b>search (2)</b> 97:20,20 <b>seated (2)</b> 6:3;60:3 <b>Second (15)</b> 7:15;14:17;17:25,25; 18:24;19:6;47:18;51:2; 63:19;64:23,24;67:8; 68:17;74:17;103:23 <b>secondary (2)</b> 106:25;108:24 <b>secondly (3)</b> 19:2;33:5;77:6 <b>Section (2)</b> 95:2,8 <b>secured (1)</b> 38:20 <b>Security (2)</b> 107:14;111:6 <b>seeing (1)</b> 85:11 <b>seek (5)</b> 14:9;24:19,22;36:9; 96:1 <b>seeking (6)</b> 20:18;58:22,22,23; 64:1;109:6 <b>seeks (1)</b> 20:17 <b>seem (6)</b> 14:13;17:3;43:25; 64:18;78:19;79:18 <b>seems (12)</b> 8:18;11:17;35:25; 36:1,2,11,17;41:20; 53:9;64:21;69:6;108:4 <b>select (1)</b> 92:19 <b>selected (1)</b> 55:4 <b>self-evident (1)</b> 48:18 <b>seller (1)</b> 11:6 <b>send (17)</b> 25:1;39:17;41:11; 43:16,19;44:7;47:16; 56:15;61:18;62:25; 66:12,19;92:20;95:23; 96:11;110:23;111:3 <b>sending (4)</b> 62:15;70:14;107:18; 113:11 <b>sends (2)</b> 69:16,16 <b>sense (5)</b> 23:18;36:12;57:23; 72:25;105:1 <b>sent (10)</b> 9:8;39:21;47:11; 56:18;62:9,10;70:4;	93:16;94:5;113:19 <b>sentence (2)</b> 48:20;118:22 <b>separate (4)</b> 28:5;47:1;91:22; 108:21 <b>separately (2)</b> 83:12;107:14 <b>September (5)</b> 9:22;13:15;42:21; 44:1;116:1 <b>serious (2)</b> 49:12;89:25 <b>seriously (4)</b> 13:1;18:23;50:20; 54:1 <b>serve (3)</b> 12:10;40:25;52:21 <b>served (3)</b> 21:11;35:25;71:7 <b>service (3)</b> 12:7,9,11 <b>services (3)</b> 36:23;49:22;69:23 <b>session (5)</b> 60:4;71:18;94:8; 110:17,22 <b>set (12)</b> 20:12;22:10;40:22; 49:23,24;53:18;54:6; 58:24;59:13;91:23,23; 94:10 <b>setting (4)</b> 58:21;102:4;115:21, 23 <b>settlement (9)</b> 42:17;55:15;59:4; 74:2;77:2,4;80:3;82:3; 91:17 <b>seven (2)</b> 72:23;73:7 <b>seventy-some-odd (1)</b> 70:6 <b>severe (1)</b> 48:13 <b>shall (4)</b> 11:5;49:8;110:8,9 <b>share (7)</b> 28:16,19,25;29:4,5; 85:13;97:25 <b>shared (2)</b> 45:4;61:5 <b>shift (1)</b> 99:13 <b>shifts (1)</b> 99:9 <b>short (4)</b> 48:7,24;56:23; 107:20 <b>shot (2)</b> 9:23;78:15 <b>showing (2)</b> 50:8;92:21	<b>shows (1)</b> 57:16 <b>sic (3)</b> 86:21;93:14;104:21 <b>sick (2)</b> 73:5;103:16 <b>side (4)</b> 18:13;27:15;78:3; 82:2 <b>sight (1)</b> 102:10 <b>sign (2)</b> 24:25;26:20 <b>significant (2)</b> 7:21;74:8 <b>significantly (2)</b> 76:17;77:10 <b>silly (1)</b> 64:21 <b>similar (2)</b> 107:15;114:9 <b>similarities (1)</b> 52:20 <b>similarly (1)</b> 99:14 <b>simple (3)</b> 12:4;51:19;63:14 <b>simply (18)</b> 26:20;34:20;46:9,17; 49:15;50:9;51:24;55:8; 58:23;68:21;91:9,9; 97:21,25;99:6;108:24; 109:9;118:15 <b>sit (2)</b> 37:1;111:9 <b>site (2)</b> 89:15,15 <b>sitting (1)</b> 118:3 <b>situated (1)</b> 99:14 <b>situation (3)</b> 35:12;67:5;83:14 <b>situations (1)</b> 71:3 <b>six (1)</b> 104:21 <b>sixty (3)</b> 49:24;104:19;116:1 <b>sixty-one (2)</b> 68:12,13 <b>Skadden (2)</b> 95:19;102:24 <b>skepticism (1)</b> 97:25 <b>Sloan (1)</b> 32:6 <b>slowly (1)</b> 32:21 <b>small (4)</b> 13:13;32:24;58:10; 68:11 <b>smaller (1)</b>	69:6 <b>snapshot (1)</b> 105:2 <b>Sobol (21)</b> 60:8,16,17,20,22,24; 61:14,19,21,23;62:1,5, 7:72;3,5,9;74:18; 75:18;77:9;79:16; 110:16 <b>Sobol's (3)</b> 77:16,23;78:9 <b>Sobor (1)</b> 72:10 <b>Social (2)</b> 107:13;111:6 <b>sole (1)</b> 28:3 <b>solely (6)</b> 13:18;17:17;28:1,1; 29:18;44:20 <b>solicitation (3)</b> 58:17;81:16;98:9 <b>solid (1)</b> 32:25 <b>somebody (4)</b> 36:20;62:13;100:3; 111:20 <b>someone (10)</b> 32:12;35:7;52:6; 53:6;57:24;72:7;74:15; 79:17;80:14;103:25 <b>sometime (3)</b> 69:11;105:8;116:1 <b>somewhat (5)</b> 7:18;8:20;34:11; 54:3;65:23 <b>somewhere (1)</b> 14:9 <b>soon (4)</b> 42:17,18;47:20;59:8 <b>Sorry (11)</b> 6:4;9:9,19;40:10; 72:15;86:5;114:12; 116:4;117:20,21; 119:24 <b>sort (4)</b> 38:4;65:23;66:22; 106:25 <b>sorts (1)</b> 66:24 <b>source (1)</b> 35:6 <b>sources (1)</b> 28:24 <b>South (1)</b> 25:14 <b>speak (9)</b> 9:1;19:7,25;32:23; 33:11;35:10;100:3; 103:4;104:11 <b>speaker (1)</b> 8:9 <b>speaking (4)</b>	32:14,16;35:12; 106:11 <b>special (3)</b> 6:8,10;26:4 <b>specific (22)</b> 46:24;49:9;52:18; 78:9,11;84:16;87:19, 21;88:3,11,19,25;89:8, 20;90:8;92:4,9;93:3, 20;98:23;99:2;108:8 <b>specifically (7)</b> 55:13;74:25;90:24; 100:15,23;102:1;103:4 <b>speculation (1)</b> 92:11 <b>speculative (1)</b> 54:3 <b>speed (1)</b> 91:15 <b>spent (1)</b> 73:16 <b>spirit (1)</b> 16:13 <b>split (1)</b> 105:6 <b>spoke (1)</b> 20:16 <b>spoken (1)</b> 68:7 <b>spreadsheet (1)</b> 51:24 <b>Springfield (2)</b> 6:20;111:23 <b>squarely (1)</b> 23:4 <b>St (8)</b> 10:25;17:9,22,25; 18:8,16;19:22;24:2 <b>standard (1)</b> 78:1 <b>start (4)</b> 15:21;56:10;102:13; 105:14 <b>started (1)</b> 20:14 <b>starts (1)</b> 56:9 <b>state (10)</b> 12:7,13;14:9;42:10; 48:6;79:2;89:3;93:6; 103:8;109:18 <b>state-by-state (1)</b> 48:11 <b>stated (3)</b> 15:6;99:16;107:9 <b>statement (6)</b> 41:25;55:20,25;56:8, 11;99:2 <b>States (9)</b> 23:13;31:12;34:25; 39:22;70:20;82:17; 105:18;113:18;114:8 <b>stating (1)</b>
--	---	--	---	---



48:21 <b>status (1)</b> 59:3 <b>statute (18)</b> 8:17,25;10:7,23; 11:3,5,11;12:14,14; 13:14,15,24,25;14:4; 46:23;48:2,3;109:16 <b>statutes (4)</b> 12:10;47:21;52:18; 109:14 <b>statutory (4)</b> 14:6;43:3;96:1; 105:24 <b>stave (1)</b> 11:20 <b>stay (2)</b> 11:16;76:16 <b>stayed (1)</b> 26:8 <b>staying (1)</b> 30:4 <b>steering (4)</b> 39:24;69:10;92:11; 111:9 <b>STERNKLAR (70)</b> 6:24,24;7:9;16:22; 23:3;25:17,22,25;26:2; 22,24;27:1,3;30:1,10, 12,15,23;34:11,14,17; 35:13;39:17;40:4,9,15, 25;41:6,9,15,18;50:16, 19,22;75:24;81:3;83:1; 85:2,13;115:8,9,13,17, 19,21;116:4,6,10,14, 17,19,21;117:1,6,8,10, 12,20,23,25;118:7,14, 23,25;119:3,6,9,13,19; 120:22 <b>Steve (1)</b> 86:20 <b>still (6)</b> 20:1;21:11,15;24:7; 51:5;72:12 <b>stop (1)</b> 101:10 <b>straight (1)</b> 98:7 <b>straightforward (2)</b> 61:7,11 <b>straightforwardly (1)</b> 62:25 <b>strategic (1)</b> 74:25 <b>strategy (4)</b> 37:5,25;39:3;42:16 <b>stress (3)</b> 13:8;17:13,14 <b>stretch (1)</b> 106:19 <b>strict (1)</b> 10:25 <b>strong (1)</b>	9:25 <b>strongly (1)</b> 50:20 <b>struggled (1)</b> 118:24 <b>struggling (1)</b> 118:10 <b>studies (2)</b> 88:10,13 <b>stuff (2)</b> 69:10;105:10 <b>subject (12)</b> 12:7,8;13:20;16:6, 17;28:23;33:1;37:18; 45:10;76:4;110:11; 115:2 <b>submissions (1)</b> 62:21 <b>submit (7)</b> 20:24;22:5,9;53:3; 56:11;84:6;95:6 <b>submitted (2)</b> 82:24;91:6 <b>submitting (1)</b> 103:9 <b>subpoena (2)</b> 46:25;98:4 <b>subpoenas (5)</b> 56:18;70:5;75:12; 92:2;120:15 <b>subsection (1)</b> 49:9 <b>subsequently (2)</b> 12:21;104:13 <b>substance (1)</b> 20:15 <b>substantial (3)</b> 34:19;54:15;55:17 <b>substantially (1)</b> 77:7 <b>substantive (4)</b> 12:18;61:3;63:16; 82:1 <b>substantively (1)</b> 109:22 <b>substitute (3)</b> 84:5;109:6;114:7 <b>success (2)</b> 77:5;89:14 <b>successful (2)</b> 70:13;73:17 <b>successfully (1)</b> 29:7 <b>suffered (4)</b> 44:10,20;54:2;80:15 <b>suffering (2)</b> 73:1;81:1 <b>suffice (1)</b> 77:5 <b>sufficient (5)</b> 20:9;43:2;47:5;64:6; 93:1 <b>suggest (2)</b>	78:9;88:7 <b>suggested (8)</b> 21:9;71:16;73:25; 76:17;81:5;84:18; 110:15;114:7 <b>suggesting (1)</b> 10:11 <b>suggests (5)</b> 88:14;89:15,23; 90:18;92:18 <b>suits (2)</b> 13:13;20:24 <b>summation (1)</b> 59:17 <b>superficial (1)</b> 52:19 <b>superfluous (1)</b> 85:8 <b>superior (1)</b> 56:25 <b>supplanting (1)</b> 52:14 <b>supplement (2)</b> 41:11;108:1 <b>supplemental (10)</b> 29:9,11;30:17;34:14; 40:9,25;62:18;76:1; 81:6;111:15 <b>supplements (1)</b> 63:9 <b>supplied (3)</b> 57:24;107:20;108:12 <b>supply (1)</b> 111:5 <b>support (4)</b> 31:10;34:3;72:22; 73:21 <b>supported (1)</b> 101:25 <b>supporter (1)</b> 9:25 <b>supportive (1)</b> 80:9 <b>supports (2)</b> 87:15;91:8 <b>suppose (5)</b> 36:6;42:13;59:14; 117:1;118:7 <b>supposed (4)</b> 58:24;65:6,7;114:15 <b>Supreme (1)</b> 110:1 <b>Sure (16)</b> 8:5,20;9:5;11:23; 12:2;30:19;38:9;41:13; 55:21;57:15;66:24; 68:20;99:25;102:12; 103:2;110:14 <b>surgery (1)</b> 104:14 <b>surprise (1)</b> 93:12 <b>surprised (2)</b>	64:14;107:2 <b>switch (1)</b> 55:8 <b>sympathetic (1)</b> 108:21 <b>symptoms (1)</b> 53:15 <b>system (1)</b> 83:25  <b>T</b>  <b>table (3)</b> 106:12;107:3,4 <b>tacks (1)</b> 78:12 <b>tailored (1)</b> 83:2 <b>tainted (3)</b> 13:11;100:15,17 <b>talk (6)</b> 18:7;102:14;113:7,8; 114:3,10 <b>talked (5)</b> 31:4;78:22;112:20; 116:3,8 <b>talking (8)</b> 37:9;48:23;65:25; 66:17;79:4;81:4; 101:10;113:14 <b>target (1)</b> 108:9 <b>targets (2)</b> 108:4,9 <b>TARIO (3)</b> 19:23,23;20:2 <b>technical (2)</b> 6:4;96:10 <b>telephone (7)</b> 8:8;15:14;17:8; 22:25;33:13;45:5; 86:19 <b>telephonically (1)</b> 119:23 <b>telling (4)</b> 19:16;70:19;89:24; 110:5 <b>ten (4)</b> 33:8;38:17;73:16; 111:12 <b>tenable (2)</b> 20:21;21:2 <b>Tennessee (18)</b> 7:6;8:17,25;9:20; 10:7,24;11:18;12:9,10; 13:9,10;14:3;15:4; 18:1;20:21;21:5,8,24 <b>tens (1)</b> 51:18 <b>term (1)</b> 80:17 <b>terminated (1)</b> 54:9	<b>terms (16)</b> 29:14;34:5;37:4,20; 44:15;45:17;57:8; 68:18;69:3;70:16;71:8, 10;80:2;108:15;111:2; 114:15 <b>test (2)</b> 20:11;65:18 <b>testing (2)</b> 65:5;90:25 <b>thanks (2)</b> 33:11;87:1 <b>that'll (2)</b> 40:22;68:25 <b>theoretical (2)</b> 76:24;78:7 <b>theory (2)</b> 20:20,25 <b>thereafter (2)</b> 109:24;110:7 <b>therefore (7)</b> 37:23;38:13;46:14; 83:7;90:3;100:20; 101:3 <b>therein (1)</b> 85:4 <b>there'll (1)</b> 80:4 <b>There're (1)</b> 75:7 <b>There've (1)</b> 10:18 <b>thinking (1)</b> 118:15 <b>third (18)</b> 46:6;48:4;51:9;56:6; 69:5;70:22;90:10,12, 14;96:5;97:13,15,17; 116:24;117:18;118:8, 20;120:13 <b>third-party (13)</b> 55:14,16,22;96:14; 102:23;108:3,9;117:2, 4,7,9,17;118:12 <b>thirty (4)</b> 71:23;75:13;104:19; 115:15 <b>Thomas (8)</b> 11:1;17:9,22,25; 18:8,16;19:22;24:2 <b>thoroughly (1)</b> 55:24 <b>thought (9)</b> 17:21;50:13;60:18; 61:22;63:23;71:5; 100:3;104:12,14 <b>thousands (1)</b> 51:19 <b>three (34)</b> 7:15,23;11:7;16:24; 44:11;45:16;49:17; 53:2;54:12;56:17;61:3; 78:14;79:4,24;87:19,
--	--	---	--	--

(20) three- - various

27:17;31:7;44:3; 48:6;58:3;70:18,20 <b>varying (1)</b> 71:1 <b>vast (1)</b> 108:20 <b>vehicle (1)</b> 42:2 <b>vendor (1)</b> 101:5 <b>vendors (1)</b> 101:1 <b>verbal (1)</b> 120:16 <b>versus (1)</b> 62:5 <b>vial (1)</b> 78:18 <b>vials (1)</b> 78:14 <b>victim (3)</b> 13:3;15:4;67:16 <b>victimimized (1)</b> 102:9 <b>victims (22)</b> 13:3;61:4,6;64:17; 65:2;67:4,21;68:2; 69:4;85:22;87:11; 102:2,3;103:14,14; 104:24;106:10,14,15; 108:19,25;109:9 <b>view (17)</b> 13:22;23:14,24,24; 28:8;34:18;44:18;46:3; 51:13,14;55:11;58:25; 66:22;67:20;83:19; 85:8;108:14 <b>viewed (1)</b> 24:21 <b>views (1)</b> 108:17 <b>violated (1)</b> 103:18 <b>violating (1)</b> 28:11 <b>violation (3)</b> 101:5;103:11,12 <b>virtually (1)</b> 79:2 <b>virtue (1)</b> 110:3 <b>vote (1)</b> 66:18 <b>votes (1)</b> 108:23 <b>voting (1)</b> 83:22	<b>waiting (3)</b> 71:24;76:3;81:2 <b>waived (1)</b> 66:1 <b>waiver (1)</b> 90:17 <b>walk (1)</b> 21:10 <b>Walker (2)</b> 6:16;9:21 <b>Walsh (1)</b> 32:6 <b>Walter (1)</b> 7:6 <b>wants (14)</b> 11:2;28:19;29:16,22; 50:1;51:2;53:5,5; 54:23;58:12;64:7,15; 106:25;110:22 <b>warn (2)</b> 117:24;118:3 <b>warranty (1)</b> 22:2 <b>wastes (1)</b> 30:8 <b>wasting (1)</b> 29:19 <b>wax (1)</b> 105:20 <b>way (24)</b> 8:22;18:13;31:8; 34:23;42:7;50:22;53:9; 9:64;10:10;65:14,15; 23,24;67:12;68:25; 71:20;75:17;88:14; 89:5;98:20;110:18,20; 114:1 <b>ways (4)</b> 50:14;53:15;71:1; 73:6 <b>Web (2)</b> 89:14,15 <b>week (6)</b> 9:12;41:3,4,4;77:11; 120:14 <b>weekly (1)</b> 93:7 <b>weeks (4)</b> 7:11;13:15;18:22; 73:16 <b>week's (3)</b> 77:12;112:13;115:10 <b>WEINER (5)</b> 99:21,23;100:4,4,9 <b>welcome (1)</b> 111:24 <b>weren't (2)</b> 38:9;66:15 <b>what's (6)</b> 10:21;14:16;27:25; 46:22;58:1;70:12 <b>whatsoever (3)</b> 17:16,23;80:22	<b>whereby (1)</b> 43:14 <b>whole (3)</b> 24:23;39:5;105:20 <b>wholesale (2)</b> 52:14;55:2 <b>who'll (1)</b> 54:2 <b>who's (3)</b> 9:21;63:8;72:7 <b>whose (5)</b> 48:24;66:1;69:23; 108:22;109:24 <b>wide (1)</b> 54:13 <b>widely (1)</b> 51:21 <b>wide-ranging (1)</b> 52:12 <b>widespread (1)</b> 7:21 <b>wife (1)</b> 10:19 <b>William (8)</b> 7:2;8:11;12:24;31:2; 32:5;72:20;120:4,7 <b>willing (2)</b> 35:9,20 <b>wisely (1)</b> 80:11 <b>wish (6)</b> 22:25;30:24;33:13; 60:7;86:19;111:23 <b>wishes (2)</b> 26:16;111:1 <b>withdraw (2)</b> 105:19;110:25 <b>within (5)</b> 22:3;40:18;43:16; 49:22;70:17 <b>without (11)</b> 12:1,17;17:23;19:18; 36:1,2;46:2;57:18; 74:8,21;93:11 <b>woods (1)</b> 104:12 <b>word (4)</b> 79:10;84:19;117:19, 21 <b>wording (1)</b> 92:18 <b>words (3)</b> 67:19;110:8;117:14 <b>work (4)</b> 37:11;51:7;79:25; 80:5 <b>worked (3)</b> 14:25;31:16;64:22 <b>working (3)</b> 16:14;36:17;37:10 <b>works (4)</b> 37:12,14;52:25;80:3 <b>world (1)</b>	75:21 <b>worth (1)</b> 38:10 <b>worthwhile (1)</b> 36:19 <b>Wow (1)</b> 60:10 <b>write (2)</b> 74:13;96:9 <b>writes (1)</b> 74:15 <b>writing (2)</b> 64:5;73:24 <b>written (3)</b> 61:9;76:8;104:4 <b>wrong (2)</b> 52:24;101:20 <b>wrongful (2)</b> 106:3,7 <b>wrongful-death (1)</b> 6:14	38:18 <b>14,000 (4)</b> 78:15,18,22;79:3 <b>15 (3)</b> 13:10;44:1;73:22 <b>153 (1)</b> 13:9 <b>15th (1)</b> 82:8 <b>16 (3)</b> 111:7;112:16;116:14 <b>160 (1)</b> 19:15 <b>16th (1)</b> 116:12 <b>170-odd (1)</b> 19:16 <b>18th (1)</b> 9:22 <b>1970s (1)</b> 8:18
			<b>Y</b>	<b>2</b>
			<b>year (3)</b> 54:8;73:3,3 <b>years (7)</b> 38:17;43:17;44:9; 47:24;71:24;81:2; 89:18 <b>yesterday (1)</b> 22:19 <b>young (1)</b> 10:14	<b>2 (1)</b> 20:7 <b>2:39 (1)</b> 60:1 <b>20 (3)</b> 42:21;84:15,20 <b>200 (1)</b> 14:21 <b>2002 (3)</b> 97:5,7,7 <b>2002a7 (2)</b> 49:6,9 <b>2012 (7)</b> 9:22;71:3;87:20,22; 88:12;90:8;92:10 <b>2013 (1)</b> 93:8 <b>2016-1 (1)</b> 39:20 <b>20th (1)</b> 44:1 <b>21st (5)</b> 87:20;88:12;89:1; 90:8;92:9 <b>22 (4)</b> 111:22,25;112:16; 119:17 <b>22nd (5)</b> 113:8,14;114:16; 119:8,25 <b>26 (1)</b> 21:12 <b>28 (1)</b> 105:17 <b>29 (1)</b> 21:12 <b>29-280-102 (1)</b> 11:4 <b>29-28-106 (1)</b>
			<b>1</b>	
			<b>1 (1)</b> 20:6 <b>1,900 (2)</b> 78:25;79:3 <b>1:04 (1)</b> 6:1 <b>10 (2)</b> 111:22;112:17 <b>100 (1)</b> 14:21 <b>107 (2)</b> 95:2,8 <b>11 (30)</b> 6:7,9,11,25;19:2; 23:2;31:17,22;35:17; 37:14;39:22,23;60:5; 77:3;82:21;84:22; 97:12;107:10,18; 108:13;109:2;110:2, 10;111:3,8;112:1,10, 13,15;120:20 <b>11f (1)</b> 85:1 <b>12-19882 (1)</b> 6:5 <b>13 (1)</b>	

10:22 <b>29-28-106b (1)</b> 12:14				
<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>			
<b>3:03 (1)</b> 60:2 <b>3002.1 (1)</b> 85:5 <b>3002-1 (1)</b> 49:20 <b>3003c3 (1)</b> 58:23 <b>327e (1)</b> 26:5 <b>350,000 (1)</b> 77:20 <b>356 (1)</b> 54:11 <b>372 (2)</b> 82:24;100:12 <b>373 (1)</b> 17:10 <b>391 (1)</b> 18:25	<b>7 (1)</b> 77:4 <b>700 (1)</b> 68:4 <b>7001 (1)</b> 96:2 <b>7023 (1)</b> 52:16 <b>741 (1)</b> 10:19			
<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>			
<b>4 (5)</b> 11:8;12:1,5;15:17; 120:11 <b>4,000 (1)</b> 77:19 <b>4:42 (1)</b> 120:24 <b>45 (2)</b> 64:10,20 <b>457 (1)</b> 79:1	<b>8 (1)</b> 44:1			
<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>			
<b>5 (4)</b> 11:8,8;78:20,24 <b>50 (1)</b> 85:25 <b>502b9 (2)</b> 49:21;85:24 <b>503b9 (4)</b> 49:20;86:2,3;109:11	<b>9006b6 (1)</b> 50:5 <b>9007 (1)</b> 49:10			
<b>6</b>				
<b>6 (5)</b> 73:20;83:1,12;84:14; 87:22 <b>60 (1)</b> 74:11 <b>61 (2)</b> 10:19;68:5				